THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH

BY

THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, D.LITT., D.D.

FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY
LATE ORIEL PROFESSOR OF INTERPRETATION IN OXFORD UNIVERSITY
AND CANON OF ROCHESTER

LONDON
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK
1908

PREFACE

I WOULD most gladly have offered the reader results of study which involved somewhat less unpopular critical presuppositions. The time for that does not seem to have come, but I think that with a good will students who have not gone as far as I have will be able to find many useful facts and ideas in my book. The Introduction contains an explanation of a theory which is assumed in the following studies, and which ought to be called, not the Jerahmeelite, but the North Arabian theory. It also contains answers to critics, many of whom, as it seems to me, have continued the bad tradition of controversial unfairness which has been handed down to us from an earlier age. I hope that those who misapprehend and misrepresent, or who not less unfortunately ignore me, may be brought to a sense of their injustice, without having their feelings wounded, by what I have written. I should not have sought to answer them if the injury done to the cause of free inquiry had not been so great.

Part I. gives an account, as complete as the often doubtful evidence allows, of that interesting and changeful period which begins with the finding of the great law-book in the Temple under Josiah, and ends with the destruction of Jerusalem. It has, of course, not been possible to treat this portion of history without reference to an earlier period. The contents of the work called *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel* have therefore had to be frequently referred to. As to the higher criticism, it will be clear that my

conclusions on Genesis and Exodus throw considerable doubt on the strict accuracy of its results. The time has not come, however, to revise these results. I have, therefore, provisionally adopted the generally accepted statements. Professor Eerdmans' relative conservatism in textual matters makes it unwise to follow him implicitly, suggestive as his recent work on the composition of Genesis may be. I am, however, glad of his support in the view that the narrators of Genesis, generally speaking, believed in more than one god. If he has ignored my own work, that is no reason why I should ignore or depreciate his.

Part II. contains a study of the Israelite law-books, with the exception of the Priestly Code, which, though it certainly contains a kernel of older date, is in its present form naturally considered to be post-exilic. Both here and elsewhere the point of view is that set forth in *Traditions and Beliefs* and in the Introduction, which, while recognising both direct and indirect Babylonian influence on Palestine, finds in the extant evidence a larger amount of reference to N. Arabian influence, both political and religious.

In conclusion, I may draw attention to a passage in the Introduction relative to the one-sided character of the literary monuments of the pre-exilic period, which helps to account for the large number of problems which are very plausibly solved by the N. Arabian theory. I think that this suggestion makes for peace. The present condition of the study of the Old Testament is far from satisfactory; there is still a sad amount of partisanship, though the points at issue have changed. 'Give peace in our time, O Lord!'

OXFORD, *Sept.* 18, 1908.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VI

CHAPTER VII

PART II

THE LAW-BOOKS (EXCEPTING THE PRIESTLY CODE)

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER VI

INTRODUCTION

THE 'JERAHMEELITE[1] THEORY' A MISTAKEN NAME FOR A GENUINE THING, WITH AN ANSWER TO CRITICS, AND OTHER PRELIMINARIES

I

IN the present Introduction the writer, with much reluctance, deserts the paths of simple inquiry and exposition. He will not, however, try the reader's patience by condescending to the procedure of ordinary controversialists. The attacks directed against him may often have been of a singular vehemence. But the only mode of self-defence that he will adopt is the removal of misapprehensions. Very likely the most violent of his assailants may pass over these pages, but there must still be some unspoiled Bible-students who value the jewel of an open mind, and who would say to the writer as the Roman Jews said to St. Paul, "We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest." What is it, then, that requires to be freed from misapprehensions? It is the N. Arabian theory in its fullest form. It is here contended that Arabia, and more distinctly North Arabia, exercised no slight political and religious influence upon Israel, especially upon the region commonly known as Judah. And now, as always, the writer will combine this with a Babylonian theory, viz. that, subsequently to a great migration of Jerahmeelites and kindred Arabian peoples in a remote century (B.C. 2500 ?), and again later, Babylonian

[1] The present Introduction, in a shortened form, has appeared in the *Hibbert Journal*, October 1908. Hence the irregular spelling, 'Jerahmeel' for 'Yeraḥme'el,' 'Mizrim' for 'Miṣrim.'

culture exercised a wide influence on Syria and Palestine, and that South Arabia too, which was within the Babylonian sphere of influence, and about which we may hope soon to know much more,[1] profoundly affected North Arabia, and, through North Arabia, South Palestine. Both directly and indirectly, therefore, Palestine received a powerful and permanent stimulus from Babylonian culture.

The portion of this complex theory which is most sharply attacked is one which claims to be based, not only on inscriptional evidence, but also on passages of the Old Testament. The question whether it really has an Old Testament basis has not yet, I think, received half enough attention. This is unfortunate. The South Arabian evidence may be only probable; the Assyrian and the Hebrew may, in my opinion, be called decisive. Open-minded students may well be surprised that there should be Biblical scholars of the first and second rank who fail to see this, and who, strong in their presumed security, not only attack the N. Arabian theory themselves, but warn their pupils or readers against it as a phantasy.

It may perhaps be objected that the keenest adversaries are a relatively small number of persons, who, being on these questions orthodox, may be expected to show the qualities characteristic of orthodoxies. In reply, lapsing into the first person, I admit that the most hostile writers may be comparatively few, but when a number of the larger and less bitter class, in paraphrasing a simple narrative of the origin of a book, succeeds in transforming an act of generosity into an act of calculating prudence,[2] even a saint might feel justified in breaking silence. Is this, then, the right way for a young convert to the historical spirit (for such Prof. Witton Davies is) to treat a work of some originality? I know that it is hard to enter into a new point of view, but those who cannot yet do this are scarcely

[1] The death of Eduard Glaser the explorer makes it probable that the inscriptions (about 2000) which he had collected will soon become available to scholars.

[2] I am sorry to have to point this out, for Prof. Davies is zealous for the higher education in Wales. But it is inevitable. See *Review of Theology*, etc., edited by Prof. Menzies, May 1908, p. 689, and cp. *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel*, p. v, 'To the Reader.'

qualified reviewers. It is disappointing, but I must confess that hitherto only 'one man among a thousand have I found' (Eccles. vii. 28), and he is an American. Prof. Davies says that he is also an ex-Baptist, and that he has 'defended some points of Jerahmeelism.' Apparently the two things go together.

Professor Nathaniel Schmidt (the 'one man' referred to) has written an article in the *Hibbert Journal* (January 1908), entitled 'The "Jerahmeel" Theory and the Historic Importance of the Negeb.' The opening words remind me too much of the misleading title of another American article, 'Israel or Jerahmeel.'[1] The truth is that there are other ethnic or regional names of N. Arabia—Mizrim, Asshur, Cush—which would have as much right to form part of the title of the theory as Jerahmeel. I would dissuade, however, from parading any of these names in a title. Let the names be well studied, remembering the important questions symbolised by them, but let not any one of them be singled out to the disparagement of the rest. If I now give an incomplete study of one of the names, the reader will understand that it is not with the object of making a new title for a theory.

The passages which I am about to consider are some of those which contain the N. Arabian regional name, Asshūr (or Shūr) or Ashḥur, perhaps the A'shur of Minæan inscriptions.[2] And first, let us study Gen. xxv. 3 and Ezek. xxvii. 23. In the former, Asshur[im][3] is connected most closely with Dedan, and only less closely with Sheba, which are both admittedly N. Arabian. In the latter, Asshur stands between Sheba and Kilmad, both which one expects to be N. Arabian. Kilmad is no doubt corrupt, but the origin is plain. KLMD has come from RKML, which, like the place-name KRML, represents Jerahmeel.

Next Gen. xxv. 18. Here, certainly, Asshur is best explained as a N. Arabian regional name. The true

[1] See *American Journal of Theology*, October 1907 (article by Prof. H. P. Smith).

[2] See the inscription Glaser 1155, first pointed out by Hommel. See p. xv (n. 5).

[3] Prof. Ed. Meyer is bold enough to question the existence of Asshurim (*Die Israeliten*, p. 220).

rendering is, 'And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, which is in front (*i.e.* eastward) of Mizrim.' To this an ancient gloss is added, 'in the direction of Asshur'; Shūr is the short for Asshūr.

Another passage is Gen. xxiv. 63. Here no doubt the text is corrupt, but the right correction, for those who are not 'naturally prejudiced,' is transparent. But let us first look at the traditional text, which may be represented thus, 'And Isaac went out to *x* in the field at eventide.' Here *x* stands for a word which is corrupt and untranslatable—in short, an unknown quantity. A list of the widely different renderings of commentators would at once make this clear. And until we try some new methods we shall still continue to be baffled; *x* will remain *x*. If, however, we overcome our 'natural prejudice' and apply the new methods, we shall see that the true reading (for *x*) is 'to Asshur,' which should probably be restored to verse 62, where a place-name is really wanted. Thus we get for verses 62, 63, 'Now Isaac had come to Ashḥur from the way (*i.e.* the caravan road) to the Well of Jerahmeel, for he was a dweller in the Negeb. And Isaac went out into the field at eventide,' etc. Ashḥur was probably, not the region so called, but the city where Ephron and, for a time, Abraham dwelt, and which was called, corruptly, Kiriath-arba', *i.e.* Ashḥoreth-'Arāb.[1] The Well of Jerahmeel, mis-called Beer-lahai-roi, was no doubt the great central well of the north Jerahmeelite country. For a definite view of the situation of this country we may turn to Gen. xxv. 18, already explained.

Another interesting passage is 1 Sam. xxiv. 14 (cp. the parallel, xxvi. 20). Does our Bible really give us the original writer's meaning? With tasteless servility the chivalrous David is here made to say—what every one remembers and wonders at. The true reading, however, of the closing words is, not פרעש אחד, but פרא אשחור, 'a wild ass of Ashḥur.' A good part of the wide region called Asshur or Ashḥur was no doubt steppe country, where wild asses delighted to roam (Job xxxix. 5-8). That, surely, is a figure both fine in itself and specially appropriate for

[1] See *Traditions and Beliefs*, pp. 337 *f.*, 349 *f.*

David, who roamed at large in the south country like a wild ass.

We have seen where an early narrator placed the N. Arabian Asshur. It is quite another thing to be able to locate it on the map. It is also troublesome that we have two N. Arabian Asshurs to provide for, there being apparently two uses of the name, a narrower and a wider.[1] There was an Asshur which probably adjoined, and anciently may have included, the Negeb, and another which was some way from Southern Palestine, and whose king at some period claimed suzerainty over the smaller kingdoms to the north, including especially Mizrim. One might possibly identify this with Meluḫa, which, as an inscription of Sargon tells us, adjoined Muzri. The capital was probably called Bābel.[2]

II

I have mentioned these things, partly to justify my objection to the phrases 'the Jerahmeel theory' and 'Jerahmeelism,' partly because of the intrinsic importance of the result to which the facts appear to point, viz. that the rulers of a distant Arabian land, called *conventionally* by the Israelites Asshur or Ashḥur, were strong enough to invade the Negeb and the land of Judah, and were confounded by later scribes with kings of Assyria. The cause of the confusion is obvious; it is that the tradition of Assyrian invasions was still in circulation. Parallels for the confusion are given elsewhere (pp. 86 *ff.*). I may therefore now proceed to explain another regional name Mizrim, or, in Assyrian, Muzri or Muzur, which I have already had occa-

[1] Hommel, however, who knows only of one Asshur, thinks that it extended from the Wady el-Arîsh (= the *naḥal Mizrim* ?) to Beer-sheba and Hebron, and that it is the A'shur mentioned, together with Muzr, in a Minæan inscription dating, according to him, before 1000 B.C. Winckler, however, makes the inscription several centuries later, and others (*e.g.* N. Schmidt) bring it down to Cambyses. It is interesting that in crusading times there was a thick forest, called Assur, near the coast, some way to the north of Jaffa (Maspero in the Leemans memorial volume).

[2] Among the curiosities of Prof. Witton Davies (*Rev. of Theology*, p. 692) is a Babel in the Negeb, for which I am not responsible.

sion to use. Whether it means 'border region' seems to me doubtful; the true meaning of regional names is not always the most plausible one. There is, however, one result of criticism which seems to me to have not been overthrown either by Ed. Meyer, or by Flinders Petrie, or by the newest writer, A. T. Olmstead:[1] it is that there was a second land of Mizrim or Muzri, not indeed in the Negeb (as the latest writer strangely supposes Winckler to think), but in a tract of N. Arabia extending perhaps as far south as Medina, and in the north probably not far removed from the better-known Mizrim,[2] *i.e.* the Nile Valley. Many equally strange doublings of regional names will at once occur to the scholar. For instance, it is an irrefutable historical fact, not dependent on 1 K. x. 18, 2 K. vii. 6,[3] that there was a third Muzri in N. Syria.[4] The Assyrian inscriptions state that it sent tribute to Shalmaneser II., and that its king was afterwards a vassal of Damascus.

About the second Muzri there is, I admit, much dispute. Among younger scholars one may refer with pleasure to L. B. Paton and Wilhelm Erbt, but it is a misfortune that Prof. N. Schmidt's pupil, A. T. Olmstead, should have expressed himself so strongly against Winckler (other critics on the same side are not even mentioned), because strong language always makes it difficult to turn back, especially when you have made such a huge mistake again and again as to represent your opponent as believing in a Negeb Muzri. I sorely fear that Prof. Ed. Meyer is not unaffected by this. Fortunately Winckler is great even as a controversialist. Fortunately, too, it is admitted by all that there are some inscriptional references to Muzri which cannot possibly mean either a N. Syrian state or the land which we know as Egypt.

Things being so, we must give our best attention to any evidence adduced from Assyrian or Egyptian sources, and

[1] *Western Asia in the days of Sargon of Assyria* (1908), pp. 56-71.

[2] Mizrim and Mizraim are virtually the same. See *Enc. Biblica*, 'Mizraim.'

[3] The plausibleness of Winckler's view may be frankly admitted. Olmstead's remarks (*op. cit.* p. 58) hardly do justice to this.

[4] According to the later boundaries.

the newest writer on Biblical archæology[1] refers me, in correction of my own views, to Prof. Flinders Petrie. Be it so. Eager and impetuous, alike as an explorer and as a writer, Prof. Petrie must produce some effect, even though it may not be altogether what he desires. I therefore turn to his latest expression of opinion, and what do I find? He tells us that the theory of a second Muzri is a fantastic result of unchecked literary criticism.[2] Have we really to believe this? I admit that all unchecked criticism is dangerous; but how can the Muzri theory (for me, a part of a larger theory—the N. Arabian), based as it is on inscriptional as well as literary evidence, be an example of this? Or will it be asserted that unchecked inferences from inscriptions are less dangerous? Can one, for instance, infer from the fact that 'Sinai' contains Egyptian monuments down to the 20th dynasty (Petrie, 1202-1102 B.C.), and from that other fact (if it be such) that the Egyptian frontier stretched across into S. Palestine at many periods, that a Hebrew writer would call the added region Mizraim? Yet Prof. Petrie draws this inference, while frankly admitting (*Researches*, p. viii) that 'there is no trace (in Sinai) of any permanent garrison.' Elsewhere[3] this scholar speaks of the supposed Muzri as situated in 'the almost uninhabited desert.' Such an assertion, however, is arbitrary. As Hugo Winckler remarks, 'If Roman civilisation penetrated into this region under Roman rule, Oriental civilisation penetrated before under Oriental rule,' nor can we doubt that stimulating influences came from the more developed culture of S. Arabia, especially if Winckler is right in supposing that the king of Meluḫa (W. Arabia), who was probably the suzerain of Muzri, was the head of the Minæan empire,[4] *i.e.* that the archaising phrase, 'king of Meluḫa,' should rather be 'king of Ma'în.'[5] At any rate, N.

[1] See *Prehistoric Archæology and the Old Testament*, by H. J. Dukinfield Astley, M.A., Litt.D., 1908.

[2] *Researches in Sinai*, p. 195.

[3] *History of Egypt*, iii. 283.

[4] *KAT*[3], pp. 141 *f.*; cp. *Muṣri*, *Meluḫḫa*, *Ma'în* (Mitteil. der Vorderasiat. Ges.), 1898.

[5] There is a Minæan inscription (Glaser 1155) in which a district called Miṣran (postpositive article) and another district called Ma'în

Arabia cannot fail to have been affected in many ways by the more civilised south. The tillage of any productive parts of the land, especially the important oases, would certainly not have been exempt from this influence.

I have now to speak of passages respecting Muzri in the Assyrian inscriptions. And first of all, of the passage in which Tiglath-Pileser III. states that he appointed Idi-bi'lu (evidently an Arabian, not [as Meyer, Küchler, Olmstead] a tribe) to be *ḳêpu* (*ḳêputu*), or, as we, thinking of Indian states, might say, a 'resident' over Muzri.[1] Where was this Muzri situated? In 1889 Winckler supposed the reference to be to the N. Syrian Muzri, but in 1893, with more Tiglath-Pileser texts before him, he was able (in my opinion) to show that a N. Arabian Muzri would alone satisfy the conditions of the case. Prof. Petrie, however, whom our latest Biblical archæologist brings up against me, interprets this Muzri as, not indeed the Nile Valley, but either what he calls Sinai or the isthmus of Suez. One or two chiefs on the eastern side of the Egyptian empire, who had acquired their independence, may have made their submission, and received an Assyrian resident. The theory takes no account of the other facts adduced by Winckler, and implies that the Assyrian king had an ill-served intelligence department.

Next, I will refer to an inscription of Sargon. It tells how Jamani (probably a Jamanite or Javanite of N. Arabia),[2] an adventurer put up by the anti-Assyrian party in Ashdod,

Miṣran are mentioned as being under a Minæan viceroy (כבר). See Winckler, *Altor. Forsch.* i. 29, 337. According to Olmstead, the Miṣran here mentioned is 'naturally taken (by Winckler) to be his Negeb Muṣri' (*Sargon*, p. 59). That is not the case. Winckler says, 'only the N. Arabian region el-Miṣr and the Minæan colonies in N. Arabia (inscriptions of el-Oela!) can be meant.' It should be noticed that A'shur is also mentioned, and carefully distinguished from Miṣr. The question arises, Is this the N. Arabian Asshur of the O.T. which the commentators agree to pass over?

[1] See Winckler, *Die jüngsten Kämpfer wider den Pan-Babylonismus*, p. 42.

[2] Less probably a Phœnician or (so, after Winckler, Olmstead, *Sargon of Assyria*, pp. 77 *f.*) a Greek from Cyprus, or (Winckler, *Muṣri*, etc., p. 26, n. 1) a man of Jemen (Yemen). Like Jamani, Omri, Zimri, and Tibni were all probably adventurers from N. Arabia (see *E. Bib.*). As for Winckler, what is the history of the name Jemen? Did 'Jaman' (= Jerahmeel, p. xxxvi) extend to S. Arabia?

fled before Sargon 'to the region of Muzur which is at the entrance to Meluḫa.' This at least is Winckler's present translation. I do not know whether it is *the* correct one. It is possible to render 'to the border of Muzur, which (*i.e.* Muzur) is beside Meluḫa,' which Prof. Petrie paraphrases, 'to the frontier of the Egyptian power in Sinai which joins on to Arabia.' This, he says, is 'a perfectly sound expression.' It is at any rate sound English, but in what sense can it have been said that the region which Prof. Petrie designates Sinai was distinct from Meluḫa? And can Meluḫa be rightly paraphrased 'Arabia'? The inference which Prof. Petrie, and now too (June 1908) a young American scholar,[1] have not drawn from the Assyrian phraseology, but surely ought to have drawn, is that the Muzur referred to by Sargon needed to be distinguished from some other Muzur, *i.e.* naturally, from Egypt.

I see no necessity for discussing these points further. Dr. Astley has accused me (not discourteously) of rashness on the ground of historical statements of Prof. Petrie, and these statements, upon examination, prove to be very doubtful. The chance, however, remains that some other writer may compel my assent. Let us search the more recent books and magazines.

I have no doubt that all honest work contains elements of truth. But though both Küchler[2] and Olmstead[3] are promising young scholars, and have really worked at the inscriptions, they are (as I have pointed out elsewhere) not open-minded enough for their criticisms on older scholars (which contain serious inaccuracies) to be accepted. Prof. Eerdmans, too, a scholar of higher rank, in his notice of my second Psalter in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, has fallen into grave misapprehensions, and is hampered by an inflexible textual conservatism. I turn therefore unsatisfied from Leyden to St. Andrews, and look into the useful review

[1] See Olmstead, *Sargon*, p. 79, who remarks, most unsatisfactorily, 'When Muṣuri is said to be *sha pat* of the region of Meluḫa, need it mean more than that the fact of Ethiopic control was known in Nineveh?'

[2] *Die Stellung des Propheten Jesaja*, etc., Tübingen, 1906; reviewed in *Rev. of Theology*, Jan. 1907.

[3] *Western Asia in the Days of Sargon of Assyria*, New York, 1908.

edited by Prof. Menzies. Here another young scholar appears, Prof. Witton Davies by name. I have already had to speak of him; he doubtless wishes to promote Old Testament researches, but I cannot see on what lines he expects to do this. At any rate he firmly holds that every form of the N. Arabian theory is 'impossible.' How, he demands to be told, can two peoples, both called Mizrites, 'have existed side by side without some notice of the fact?' And must not an exodus from a N. Arabian land of Mizrim 'have been known to at least the oldest writers (Amos, etc.) of the Bible, who connect it with the well-known Egypt?' To Drs. Küchler and Olmstead I need not reply here; indeed, I have elsewhere criticised them already. To Prof. Witton Davies, however, I may continue my remarks. First, it is too much to assert that 'no notice of the fact' was ever given. One notice we have found already in Sargon's inscription, and in such O.T. passages as Deut. iv. 20, Ps. lxxviii. 51, cv. 27, cvi. 21, 22, a reference to N. Arabia (rather than to Egypt) is guaranteed by the rule of synonymous parallelism. Prof. Witton Davies may indeed question this in Deut. iv. 20, but the phrase 'the furnace of iron' has no meaning, and only prejudice can oppose the methodical textual correction, 'the furnace of Arabia of Ishmael' (see p. 144). Still less can it be denied that 'Mizrim' in the passages from the Psalms is synonymously parallel to 'Ham.' What, then, does this strange, short name signify? I think I have answered the question elsewhere (see p. xxvii). It is an abridgment of the form 'Jarḥam,' and is therefore equivalent to the racial as well as tribal name 'Jerahmeel.' Passing to the second point, how can any critic prove that references in Amos and Hosea to 'the land of Mizrim' in connexion with the exodus mean 'the land of Egypt'? A thorough study of Amos and Hosea seems to point rather to the land of Mizrim in N. Arabia.

III

I turn much more hopefully to Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, both because he has attracted the censure of an opponent of my own, and because I know that, like Chaucer's priest,

'gladly would he learn and gladly teach.' Indeed, his previous changes of opinion conclusively prove this. He is aware of the complexity of the problems before us, and fair enough to hold that neither Winckler's theories nor my own can possibly be as absurd as Prof. Eduard Meyer and his younger allies suppose. At present he inclines to think that the kings of Muzri spoken of in certain Assyrian inscriptions were not kings or viceroys of a somewhat extensive N. Arabian region, but dynasts residing either in Egypt or in districts adjoining it on the east, and also that the region called in these inscriptions Meluḫa was not Western Arabia, but Ethiopia. I am sorry that Prof. Schmidt should defend this, and against it would refer to Prof. Winckler's able reply to Eduard Meyer.[1] The latter scholar is widely different in tone from Prof. Schmidt, and his self-confidence seems to me unjustifiable.

Still, I do not myself belong to the irreconcilables, and, agreeing on this point with Winckler, am willing to make an admission in the interests alike of peace and of truth. It may be true that Meyer's view of Muzri and Meluḫa has fewer elements of truth than Winckler's in the inscriptional passages to which a Muzri and Meluḫa theory is applied. But it seems possible that Egypt and Muṣri alike, and Magan and Meluḫa, represented to the Babylonians the southern part of the earth.[2] The door is thus opened for different geographical uses of these names. Magan, for instance, may mean the east and south of Arabia, but also Nubia. At the same time, how can we believe that any Hebrew writer can have regarded Hagar as an Egyptian? The connotation of Mizrim must by a certain time have shrunk, leaving room for a twofold interpretation, Egypt and N. Arabia. Similarly Meluḫa may perhaps have come to mean either Ethiopia or West Arabia.

Prof. Davies is shocked by all this 'confusion which, according to Winckler, abounds in our Bible,' and, referring elegantly to myself, finds it 'impossible that all our notions of ancient geography should be so muddled and muddling.'[3]

[1] *Die jüngsten Kämpfer wider den Pan-Babylonismus*, Leipzig, 1907. [2] See Winckler, *E. Bib.*, 'Sinai,' §§ 4, 7.
[3] *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, May 1908, p. 697.

But can any critic assert that our 'notions' of ancient Arabian geography were ever precise? This was Prof. Schmidt's great difficulty. For a long time he hesitated as a student of the new theories because of his 'ignorance of a region of which we had no good maps and no accurate descriptions.' Hence, when Winckler ceased to identify the *naḥal Mizrim* (usually *Mizraim*) with the *Wâdy el-Arîsh*, and maintained that it was 'the stream that rushes into the sea at Raphia,' he reserved his own opinion till he could examine the locality. Winckler's difficulty, of course, was that he was loth to accuse a capable Assyrian scribe of topographical vagueness. Nor does Winckler speak of a 'rushing stream.' He is much too careful for that, and expressly remarks that even an insignificant water-course might have political and legendary importance. Whether this is a conclusive argument, is very doubtful. A water-course like the Wady el-Arîsh must surely have been specially distinguished in phraseology. I have not myself seen the wady, but the description of it given by the late Lieut. Haynes seems to me ground sufficient for adhering to the usual view. Winckler's comment on the Assyrian passage, however, is certainly interesting.

But the Cornell professor's interest centres in the Negeb —that region at the extreme south of Palestine which forms the transition to North Arabia, and which his assistant, Dr. Olmstead, so strangely makes Winckler identify with Muzri. The cause of his interest is manifest—it is the close association of localities in the Negeb with the history of religion. Some of the eloquent sentences in which he sums up his views sound almost like passages from the article on Prophecy in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Nor can I avoid mentioning that he still holds the opinion that 'the Jerahmeelite [rather N. Arabian] theory unquestionably promises to throw much light on the obscure history of the Negeb.'[1] Among the points of detail referred to by Prof. Schmidt is the origin of the Cherethites, who, in David's early time, occupied a section of the Negeb. Were they really Philistines who had come over from Crete? Prof. Schmidt thinks so, and the view is widely held; it is indeed as old as the Septuagint.

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Scythians,' § 8.

We know, however, that Cherethites and Pelethites formed the bodyguard of King David, and it cannot be called likely that this force was composed partly of Semitised descendants of a Cretan race (Cherethites), partly of fully Semitic Arabian tribesmen, akin to David (Pelethites). The prevalent theory is based on 1 Sam. xxx. 16 (cp. *v.* 14). But is it certain that 'the land of the Philistines' is not equivalent to 'the land of the Pelethites'? Is it certain, too, that David's suzerain the king of Gath was a Philistine?[1] If Achish were a Philistine, is it likely that he would have accepted David as a vassal, or that David would have wished to become one? And is it not plain that Gath and Ziklag lay farther south than is consistent with their being in the ordinary sense Philistian localities?

Who the Cherethites were, will, I hope, appear presently. At present I devote myself to the very difficult name 'Philistine' (פלשתי). It is most obvious to identify it with 'Purusati,' the first on the list of the 'sea-peoples,' which, perhaps about 1230 B.C., invaded Syria from the north, and were opposed on land and sea by Rameses III. We cannot, however, infer from this (assuming it to be correct) that Saul and David had to deal with Semitised descendants of the Purusati. Indeed, with Hommel I am of opinion that those of the Purusati who remained in Palestine found it convenient to settle in the north. Prof. Schmidt will admit that this view is perfectly tenable, and that my theory that the seemingly express references to Philistines in the O.T. are due to a confusion between Pelishtim and Pelethim is at any rate plausible. For my own part I cannot recall any other critical theory of which even this can be said. The confusion referred to must have spread widely in Palestine, and have been current even among the most highly educated class, from whom, in the eighth century, the Assyrian scribes must have derived it. We need not therefore emend 'Philistines' into 'Pelethites,' provided that, in our translations, we attach to the former a marginal gloss, 'that is, Pelethites.' There is evidence enough that the O.T. writers really meant, not

[1] A king of Ekron is called I-ka-u-su in an inscription of Esarhaddon. But (1) the reading is somewhat uncertain, and (2) in any case a Pelethite might have borne the name.

what the ordinary student means by 'Philistines,' but some population in South Palestine or North Arabia which inhabited not only the Negeb (1 Sam. xxx. 16), but Gerar (Gen. xx., xxvi.) and the so-called five Philistine cities (Josh. xiii. 3).

And who were those 'Pelethites'[1] whom I am virtually substituting for the familiar Philistines? Let us look at the evidence.[2] (*a*) In three of the so-called Philistine cities Joshua is said to have found Anaḳites (Josh. xi. 22); now ענק is to be grouped with עכן, עקן, יעקן, כנען, עמלק, all of which names (even כנען) are of N. Arabian origin,[3] and very possibly arose out of popular corruptions of ירחמאל. (*b*) In 1 Sam. vii. 14, after a statement that Israel recovered its lost territory from the Philistines, we read that 'there was peace between Israel and the Amorites.' Now, the probability is that אמרי, like the clan-name אמר from ארם, has come by a popular transposition of letters from ארמי, 'one belonging to (the southern) Aram.' (*c*) In Judges xiv. 3, xv. 18, 1 Sam. xiv. 6, xvii. 26, 36, xxxi. 4, 2 Sam. i. 20, we find ערל (Arel[ite]), ערלים (Arelites), either in the text or as a gloss, where פלשתי (Pelishti), פלשתים (Pelishtim), or rather פלתי (Pelethi), פלתים (Pelethim), are meant. Now Arel[i] is only a popular corruption of Jerahmeel[i], unless indeed any one deliberately prefers the tasteless and misleading traditional rendering.[4] (*d*) In 1 Chr. ii. 25-33, which is based on old traditions, we have a record in genealogical form of a number of Jerahmeelite peoples or clans. If we look closely at the names we shall see that some of them at least are corruptions either of Jerahmeel, or of some equivalent name, such as Ishmael, Asshur, Ashkar, or Ashtar. Thus, Ram is the same name as Aram (see p. xxxv); Jether comes from Ashtar; 'Aṭarah also from Ashtar, but with the feminine ending; Jamin is a modification of Jaman (see p. 64, n. 1),

[1] See *E. Bib.* 'Pelethites'; *T. and B.* p. 312.

[2] The difficulties in Josh. xi. 22 and 1 Sam. vii. 14 have already been pointed out by Mr. S. A. Cook (*Critical Notes on O.T. History*, p. 44).

[3] *T. and B.* pp. 121, 175.

[4] If the reader will hunt up the references to 'uncircumcision' in the O.T., and avail himself of the help I have offered, he will receive an agreeable shock of surprise.

and 'Eker of Ashkar; while Peleth, like Tubal (Gen. x. 2) and Tophel (Dt. i. 1), comes from Ethbal, an ancient corruption of Ishmael. In short, the phrase Peleth ben Jerahmeel indicates that the Pelethites were one of the many peoples into which the ancient Jerahmeelite or Ishmaelite race broke up. According to Am. ix. 7 the Philistines, *i.e.* the Pelethites, came from Caphtor, and the original reading of Gen. x. 14 probably agreed with this; Caphtor (כפתור) is not Crete,[1] but an Arabian region, and by a permutation of letters the name has not improbably come from רחבות (Reḥoboth). Thus we see at last what the Cherethites were, viz., certainly N. Arabians, and probably Reḥobothites; and since Cherethites, like Cherîth, has almost certainly the same origin as Caphtor, and the Pelethites, in the true text of Amos, are said to have migrated from Caphtor, we may reasonably hold that tradition admitted no difference between Cherethites and Pelethites. See further on Dt. ii. 23, and *T. and B.* pp. 191 *f.*

So much for the names, which, here as elsewhere, symbolise historical facts. But was David really (as I have said) a kinsman of the Pelethites? Most probably. How else could he so easily have obtained a hold on the Negeb, and become, as Prof. Schmidt puts it, 'the creator of the Judæan state'? Did not one of his sisters marry an Ishmaelite[2] (2 Sam. xvii. 25), and he himself take one of his two first wives from (the southern) Jezreel (1 Sam. xxv. 43)? It is true he is said to have been born at Bethlehem of Judah (1 Sam. xvii. 12). But there were doubtless several places called Bethlehem; 'lehem' is a popular variation of some shortened form of Jerahmeel (like *melaḥ* in the witty phrase *ge-melaḥ*, 'valley of salt'!), so that we can well believe that there were several Bethlehems, and that one was in Zebulun, another (*Beit-Laḥm*) in the later Judah, and another in the Negeb of Judah. It is also true that David's father is called

[1] See *T. and B.* p. 191. That there are graves in a certain stratum of the remains of Gezer (supposed, from 2 S. v. 25, to be a Philistine city) containing objects which show 'a fairly strong Cretan affinity' (Myres), must not override the strong textual evidence adverse to the identification of Caphtor with Crete.

[2] See 1 Chr. ii. 16 *f.* In 2 Sam. *l.c.* Ishmael is confounded with Israel, as probably in Ezek. viii. 10 (see pp. 74 *f.*).

an Ephrathite (1 Sam. xvii. 12). But the same appellation is given to Samuel's father (1 Sam. i. 1), who was doubtless of southern origin; indeed, the Septuagint expressly calls him a 'son of Jerahmeel' (the Hebrew text has 'son of Jarḥam,' which means the same thing). Hence, unless we assume two inconsistent traditions, and neglect 1 Chron. ii. 19, 24, we must obviously hold that there was a Calebite or Jerahmeelite district called Ephrath.

IV

Thus on the Philistine question I agree more nearly with Mr. Stanley A. Cook (*Critical Notes*, 1907) than with Prof. Schmidt. But I have still quite sufficient points of contact with the latter respecting the Jerahmeelites and the Negeb. Not that even here we are completely agreed. I think that Israelites and Jerahmeelites began to mingle as early as the Exodus.[1] It also seems to me to stand to reason that the Jerahmeelites called Cherethites and Pelethites not merely served David in his bodyguard, but intermarried with Israel, and settled in the enlarged territory of Judah. I should not venture to say without qualification that it was David who made Yahweh the god of Israel, for I think that long before David's time the priesthood represented by Jethro incorporated a number of Israelite clans into the people (federation) of the Jerahmeelite God Yahweh, an event which marks the entrance of the original Israel upon a more settled stage of life. But we must, of course, acknowledge that David did much to heighten the prestige of the cult of Yahweh as practised at Jerusalem.

With regard to Moses, Prof. Schmidt held at one time that he was the historical creator of Israel, who gave to this people a new divinity, Yahweh. Now, however, he sees that Moses is a 'mythical figure,' whose home was first in Midian and then in Kadesh-Barnea, agreeing in essentials with the article 'Moses' (§§ 14, 17) in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. In details the writer of that article might not always agree with the American professor. But on this important

[1] See *T. and B.* p. 546, and cp. p. 382.

point he has the support both of Prof. Schmidt and of Prof. Ed. Meyer, viz., that 'modern historical research, when it seeks for the earliest history of the Hebrew tribes, must travel away from Egypt into N.W. Arabia.' Whether these two scholars agree in inferring from the supposed Egyptian names Moses and Phinehas that the priestly families of Kadesh must have had some connexion with Egypt, I do not know. It is at any rate Prof. Meyer's view, but I trust that no one will be so rash as to adopt it. I observe that Prof. Schmidt congratulates himself (p. 338) that his own and Prof. Meyer's main conclusion 'does not in the least depend upon the acceptance of the Muzri theory.' The statement is literally correct. I venture, however, to think that the conclusion referred to would be stronger if the two scholars did accept that theory, and if one of them at least did not support a disproved explanation of משה (Moses) and the less probable of the two explanations of Phinehas.[1] It may be added that even if the tradition of the sojourn of the Hebrew clans in Muzri be rejected, it supplies valuable evidence of the N. Arabian connexion of the Israelites and of Moses. But I for my part question whether that tradition ought altogether to be abandoned.

On another matter this fair-minded critic proclaims his agreement with me (p. 333). He thinks that I have 'rightly divined' Jerahmeelite influence upon Judah in post-exilic times. It is indeed certain that Jerahmeelite tribes under whatever names were driven north in the Persian period by the advancing Edomites (themselves pressed by the Nabatæans), and so infused a N. Arabian element into the weakened population of Judah. There is evidence for this in Ezra and Nehemiah, and to some uncertain extent in Chronicles. Thus in the post-exilic catalogue of 'the men of the people of Israel' (Ezra ii., Neh. vii.) we find among the names, as given in the Hebrew text, the benê Parʿosh (the Flea-clan!) and the benê Pashḥur (unexplained), designations which (like most others) have had a strange history, and ultimately come, each by its own road, from benê ʿArab-Asshur and its equivalent benê ʿArab-Ashḥur respectively; also the benê ʿElam Aḥer, *i.e.* benê ʿElam-

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 173, 521.

Ashḥur ; the benê Aṭer, *i.e.* benê Ashtar ; the benê Salmai, *i.e.* the benê Salmah ; the benê ʿabdê Shelomoh, *i.e.* benê ʿArab-Salmah. We find, too, the place-names Tel-Melaḥ (see p. xxiii), *i.e.* Tubal-Jerahmeel, and Tel-Ḥarsha, *i.e.* Tubal-Ashḥur. These names prove that many families from the region still conventionally called Asshur (Ashḥur, Ashtar) or Jerahmeel were admitted into the renovated Israelite community. Presumably they were proselytes or the children of proselytes. We also hear much in Ezra and Nehemiah of the abundance of mixed marriages, which, however, were not recognised by the religious authorities. In Neh. xiii. 23, 24, wives of Ashdodite origin are specially mentioned ; Ashdod (Asshur-Dōd) is a regional name of North Arabia. Another witness for an Asshurite or Jerahmeelite immigration. Let us turn next to the list of builders of the wall (Neh. iii.). The goldsmith and the spice-merchant in *v.* 8 were, surely, a Zarephathite and a Ḳorahite respectively. The 'ben Ḥur' in *v.* 9 was of an Ashḥurite family. In *v.* 14 we meet with a Rechabite, *i.e.* a Kenite, and at the end of the list with a number of Zarephathites and Jerahmeelites (surely not goldsmiths and merchants). Two of these, it will be noticed, are heads of political districts.

It would not be wise to reject this criticism as speculative. Evidence from names, critically treated, is almost irresistible. I will not, however, deny that its value would be increased by monumental evidence. It is, of course, too soon to say that no monuments exist, for we have not yet looked for them.[1] Prof. Schmidt's recent expeditions into the Negeb, when director of the American School of Archæology, were rather of the nature of preliminary surveys than of explorations, and the N. Arabian Muzri, supposed by Winckler and myself, was out of his range.[2] He informs us that he found but few *tells* in the Negeb, and specifies but one site (not a *tell*) which looked very ancient (Meshrifeh), and which he identifies with the ancient Zephath. The fewness of the mounds may surprise us, considering the long list of 'cities' in Josh.

[1] Cp. Winckler, in Helmolt's *Weltgeschichte*, iii. 230.

[2] Since the above was written, Olmstead's remarkable statement in his *Sargon of Assyria*, p. 61, came to hand,—the Negeb taking the place of Egypt for several centuries ; obviously, a mistake.

xv. 21-32 (cp. Neh. xi. 25-30). We need not indeed suppose that that list accurately represents the Negeb of early times; still the early cities (partly disclosed to us by textual criticism of legend and history) cannot have been much fewer. Let us remember, however, that 'city' in the O.T. may mean very little. Many so-called 'cities' were of highly perishable materials, and would be easily effaced by the destroyer's hand.

One criticism I cannot help making,—that Prof. Schmidt, like Prof. Meyer before him, confines the Jerahmeelites within too narrow an area. It is true that in 1 Sam. xxvii. 10, xxx. 14, the Negeb appears to be divided into sections, one belonging to Judah, and others to the Jerahmeelites. But, properly speaking, Jerahmeel was not a tribe but a race, and is to be distinguished from the tribes which broke off from the parent stock, and sometimes even developed into peoples. At this point I must ask leave to enter into more details, for of what use would unsupported general assertions be? There will have to be details about names explained from the point of view of my theory. And why not? Until any other point of view produces more natural explanations of the names I see no reason for retracing my steps. My present object is to demonstrate that the name Jerahmeel or Ishmael has more than a tribal reference.

I must, pause for a moment, however, to justify, so far as space allows, the equivalence of these two names. To me this is a fact, but Prof. Meyer's recent work on the Israelites and their neighbours does not even mention it as a possible theory. And yet it appears certain that neither this scholar nor Prof. Schmidt will be able to solve the problems of Gen. ix. 20-27 and x. without this assumption, and if it involves the novel identification of Ḥam with Yarḥam or Yerahme'el, and of Shem with Ishma or Ishmael, yet the popular shortening of ethnic names is no new phenomenon. Just so, in that much-disputed passage, Num. xxiv. 17, Sheth is a shortened form of Ashtar. This passing notice seems all the more called for, since Prof. A. R. Gordon has revived the interpretation of benê Shem as 'sons of renown' and of benê Jepheth as 'sons of beauty,'[1]

[1] *The Early Traditions of Genesis* (1907), pp. 182, 184.

while Prof. Witton Davies is even so kind as to make me say that 'Shem and Ham are in reality one word, viz. Yerakhaman, miswritten through ignorance or prejudice or both.'[1] I may add that it is difficult to read the prophets critically—with a view to textual restoration—without perceiving that the early editors and gloss-makers regarded 'Jerahmeel' and 'Ishmael' as equivalent.

V

The evidence which I have to offer for a wide reference of these names is drawn from the traditions of Babylonia, Phœnicia, and Israel. 1. Babylonia. It is the opinion of Hommel[2] that Sumu, in the royal names Sumu-abu and Sumu-la-ilu in the first dynasty of Babylon, means 'his name,' which is a periphrasis for God (*sumu-hu* being contracted into *sumû*); he compares the Hebrew Shemû-el, the Phœnician Shem-zebel,[3] and the Palmyrene (Aramaic) Shem-rapha. Other names of the same early period are Shumu-ḫammu, Sumu-ramu, Ḫammu-rabi. Hommel would call this dynasty 'Arabian,' while Winckler prefers to call it 'Canaanite.' Certainly the names must be either North Arabian or Canaanite. To me it appears that Sumu in Sumu-abu, as in the Hebrew Shem, Shemûel (Samuel), Shebuel, and Shobal, is to be connected with Ishmael, while Ramu in Sumu-ramu is to be grouped with Ram or Aram, *i.e.* Jerahmeel (see below). The stages of development we cannot, with our scanty evidence, determine. Zebel too in Shem-zebel, not less than זבל in Judg. ix. 28, is a corruption of Ishmael, the origin of which was early forgotten, just as the meaning of many religious phrases of the Bible was doubtless almost or quite forgotten long before the time of the writers who used them. Rapha is possibly an early popular corruption of 'Arāb[4] (Arabia). Ḫam, presupposed by

[1] *Review of Theology* (Menzies), May 1908, p. 695. Elsewhere, incredible as it may seem, 'Yeraḫme'el' is given as 'Yerakh.'

[2] *Grundriss der Geogr. u. Gesch. des Alten Orients*, i. 95 (n. 1); *Anc. Heb. Trad.* p. 100. Winckler too (*Gesch. Isr.* i. 130, n. 3) recognises Sumu-abu and Sumu-la-ilu as Canaanitish.

[3] *T. and B.* p. 117 (n. 1). [4] *Ibid.* p. 240.

Ḫammu (which need not represent עם) in Shumu-ḫammu and Ḫammu-rabi, is exactly parallel to Shem and has been already explained. These are, of course, not the only personal names which admit of a 'Canaanite' or North Arabian explanation, but may suffice for our present purpose. And among ethnic or tribal names special attention may be called to the name Aḫlami in the Tel el-Amarna tablet No. 291, given to an Aramæan tribe in the steppe country between the mouth of the Tigris and the Euphrates and the mountains of Edom,[1] which had some relations to the king of Babylon early in the fourteenth century. Like אחלמה in Ex. xxviii. 19, and חילם, חילאמה in 2 Sam. x. 16 *f.*, it probably comes from ירחמאל. Evidently the Jerahmeelite migration was widespread.

2. Phœnicia. Here again the royal names are specially instructive.[2] Two will suffice here, Hiram and Ithobal. The former is clearly the same as Ahiram (Num. xxvi. 38), which, according to analogy, should represent Ashḫur-Ram (= Aram; cp. 1 Chr. ii. 25), and the latter is, in its origin, identical with Abiṭub (1 Chr. viii. 11), *i.e.* ʿArab-Tub, which is a shortened form of ʿArab-Tubal. It should be remembered that the early Hebrew traditions represent the Israelites, the Jerahmeelites, the Mizrites, and the Philistines (Pelethites) as speaking either the same tongue, or not widely different dialects of the same tongue; such a community of language certainly existed between the Phœnicians and the Israelites. No wonder, then, that a series of names should be held in common by these peoples. If we accept these traditions, I see no possible doubt but that N. Arabian names were carried northward by the Jerahmeelites.

3. The Israelite traditions. We know (see p. 64) that there was an Asshur in the N. Arabian border-land, and also one that was called 'a far-off land,' a phrase which reminds one forcibly of Sargon's description of Meluḫa.[3] It appears from an ancient gloss inserted by mistake in the original text of Isaiah x. 5, that the far-off Asshur was considered to

[1] So Šanda, *Die Aramäer* (in *Der Alte Orient*, iv. 3), p. 4.

[2] *T. and B.* p. 46.

[3] Has Meluḫa, like Aḫlami, come from Jerahmeel? Hebrew parallels are מנוח (Judg. xiii. 2), מנוחה (Judg. xx. 43), מנחת (Gen. xxxvi. 23).

be 'in Jarḥam.' It is true the traditional text says, not 'in Jarḥam,' but 'in their hand,' and Duhm, who holds that הוא בידם is a correctly written gloss, thinks that the gloss-maker had taken offence at the poetical statement that Asshur himself was a staff or rod. Poor silly annotator! But was he really so dull? Do not commentators sometimes nod? There are not a few geographical glosses in the Hebrew Bible,[3] and surely this is one. The gloss, in its true form, runs thus: הוא בירחם, 'it (viz., Asshur) is in Jarḥam' (*i.e.* in North Arabia).

Another tradition of great interest is given in Num. xxiv. 20, 'Amalek was the first of the nations.' Certainly the first of the nations must have spread itself out widely. But what is this strange-sounding name Amalek? Evidently transposition and permutation of letters has taken place; עמלק, like קמואל, comes from ירחמאל. Hence the Kenites can be said equally well to dwell near the Amalekites and near the Jerahmeelites (1 Sam. xv. 6, xxvii. 10, xxx. 29). We even find the same geographical limits given to the Ishmaelites in Gen. xxv. 18*a* and to the Amalekites in 1 Sam. xv. 7.

We cannot, then, be surprised that Mizrim too (see p. xviii) was considered Jerahmeelite and Asshurite. In Gen. x. 6 the pointed text calls the second of the sons of Ḥam Mizraim. But, as Mr. S. A. Cook perceives,[1] Ḥam is, to say the least, a S. Palestinian name, so that the reading Mizraim (Egypt) is at once condemned. In fact, as we have seen, Ḥam is a shortened form of Jarḥam. Psalmists too support the view expressed in Gen. x. (Ps. lxxviii. 51, cv. 23, 27, cvi. 22). They actually make Mizrim parallel to Ḥam. Ḥam, as usual, is = Jerahmeel, and though some commentators defend a reference to Egypt by adducing the native name for Egypt—*kemet* (the black country)—the improbability of this is obvious. We also find Ḥam as the name of a southern stock to which the original inhabitants of a valley near Gerar (which in Gen. xxvi. 1 is a Philistine, *i.e.* Pelethite, country) are said in 1 Chr. iv. 40 to have belonged. Comparing *v.* 40 with *v.* 43, we see that Ḥam and Amalek are here synonymous, so that one branch of the Ḥamites went

[1] *Critical Notes*, p. 58 (n. 2).

by the name of Amalek, which is indeed merely a modification of Jerahmeel. To the confusion of Mizrim and Mizraim we shall return later.

Summing up, it has been shown by the above facts that the Jerahmeelites were a widely-spread race, portions of which, starting from Arabia, settled in Babylonia, Syria, Phœnicia, and both the north and the south of the land of Israel.

I will now turn to some of the other personal and place-names in the Hebrew traditions upon which I have endeavoured to throw some fresh light. My friend Prof. Schmidt may or may not see that I am on the right track, but he cannot avoid recognising the precariousness of the current conjectures. Nor can he help regretting the tone of the following sentence in an article, already (p. xi, n. 1) referred to, by Dr. H. P. Smith, a professor at Meadville Theological Seminary (U.S.A.): 'We are at a loss to discover why Jabal, Jubal, Mahalaleel, Lamech, . . . should not have been allowed to appear in their original form as Jerahmeel, or why Joktheel should supplant Jerahmeel as the name of a city, or why Beer-lahai-roi should be forced into the place of En-Jerahmeel.' Allowed! Supplant! Be forced! Could there be any greater proof of unwillingness to enter into a new point of view than this? Surely the first duty of the critic is not to tell the world whether he agrees with, *i.e.* is prejudiced in favour of, some other scholar, but to show that he comprehends the other's point of view. And the second duty is 'like unto it': it is to study the new tracks which the new point of view has suggested to that other, and state where he understands and where he requires further help, and also no doubt where he can himself offer help to that other. And the whole investigation should be permeated by the spirit of fairness and accuracy.

But no, the critic is not to be the fellow-student, and in some sense the disciple, of that other, but his judge. As if any critic could venture either to praise or to blame a book of extensive range and originality, except with modesty, and as the result of sympathetic study. A judge, indeed, is not called upon to be modest, but how can any critic pass

sentence on a book of this character? If he assumes the rôle of judge, is he not in imminent danger of hindering the progress of his study, and discouraging that originality which is the salt of learning, and the prize of long years of critical research?

For his own part, the Meadville professor is convinced that 'proper names, both of persons and places, are tenacious of life.' That is not untrue, but life assumes many forms, and no verbal forms are so apt to suffer change as personal and place-names. In the case of the Hebrew names this transformation was greatly facilitated by historical circumstances. The stories which underlie the Israelite legends were, many of them, brought from a distance, and with the stories came the names of the legendary places and the legendary heroes. These stories, if I see aright, were derived from different tribes, all Jerahmeelite, and it is probable that almost in each the name Jerahmeel took a different form, or different forms. That ethnic names like Jerahmeel, Ishmael, Asshur, Israel, should be worn down by use, was inevitable, and the attrition would have different results among different groups of people. When therefore it is said that Jabal and Jubal are forms of Jerahmeel, and that Tubal is a form of Ishmael, it is not meant that they have come directly from Jerahmeel or Ishmael, but from some popular or tribal corruptions of those names. As for these much-suffering proper names, I cannot discover that here or elsewhere Prof. H. P. Smith explains them. But in case he should say that 'praise of God' is a credible meaning for Mahalaleel, and 'strong young warrior' (Dillmann and A. R. Gordon) for Lamech, I can only regret that such statements should still be within the bounds of possibility. In 1903 Prof. Smith considered that Mehujael might mean 'wiped out by God,' which seems to me worse even than explaining Methushael 'man of Sheol.'[1] Or can Prof. Smith really think that tradition would substitute for the genuine names of ancient tribes other names of artificial origin which indicated that the tribes had become 'wiped out,' and had as it were gone down to Sheol? Some readers may think these problems

[1] *Old Testament History*, p. 24.

trifling. They are not trifling; they affect many more questions which have not been answered with such a skill and insight as would justify the contemptuous rejection of new methods and results. As I have pointed out (*T. and B.* p. 107), these names contain corrupt forms of ירחמאל or ישמעאל. No other methodical explanation has yet, so far as my long experience goes, been offered, except, indeed, by extreme mythologists.[1]

With regard to the place-name Joktheel, there is one important point which this critic (like many others) appears to have overlooked. It is that the scene of the battle between Amaziah and the Edomites, 2 K. xiv. 7 (or, perhaps, the Arammites) was 'in the valley of [ham]melaḥ,' *i.e.* 'in the valley of Jerahmeel' ('melaḥ,' like 'leḥem,' being a witty popular corruption of that widespread racial name).[2] Joktheel is therefore most naturally viewed as a Jerahmeelite, Ishmaelite, or Asshurite name. In applying this key I have myself wavered. Most probably, however, the original name was equivalent to Ashkar-el,[3] *i.e.* 'belonging to Asshur-Jarḥam. The unsatisfactoriness of other theories must be my excuse for making the present explanation thus prominent. Many parallels to the name will be found in Joshua, in the lists of Israelitish towns.

VI

I will now mention some other forms assumed by the names Jerahmeel and Ishmael in their wanderings. Beginning with Jerahmeel, one may refer in particular to Reḳem, Kerem, Ḳedem, Aram, Javan.

(*a*) Reḳem[4] (רקם), *i.e.* Yarḥam, occurs as a Midianite

[1] Böklen, for instance, thinks that 'man of Sheol' may be right, and refer to the chthonic side of the moon-god (*Adam und Qain*, 1907, p. 132). But Prof. Smith does not belong to this school.

[2] Probably Dr. H. P. Smith will be driven to defend the ancient but difficult explanation 'Valley of Salt.'

[3] יתקאל = אתקאל = אשקאל = אשכראל. Cp. אשכל and אשקלון, and on כר in אשכר see next note. אל is merely formative.

[4] We also find both דך and דק for רקם: the former in אברך (Gen. xli. 43, *T. and B.* pp. 462 *f.*), חדרך (Zech. ix. 1), and חוזך, a place-name in M. Pognon's famous Aramaic inscription; the latter in Gen. xx. 11 (see *T. and B.* pp. 313, 467).

name in Num. xxxi. 8, a Hebronite in 1 Chr. ii. 43 *f.* (brother of Shema = Ishmael), a Manassite in 1 Chr. vii. 16 (close by are Raḥam and Jorḳeam, which can hardly be explained except as popular corruptions of Jerahmeel). Reḳem is also used in the Targum for Kadesh-Barnea, and it is extremely probable that the unintelligible ברנע (Barnea) has arisen by transposition of letters from ראבן, *i.e.* ראמן, an equivalent of Jerahmeel. Eusebius and Jerome assert that "Petra, a city of Arabia, in the land of Edom, surnamed Joktheel, is called Rekem by the Syrians' (Eus., Assyrians). The identification of Joktheel with Petra can hardly be maintained; no doubt more than one N. Arabian city bore the name of Reḳem. (*b*) Kerem (= Reḳem, by transposition and change of ḳ into k) has received a superfluous and misleading article in the place-name Beth-hakkerem, Jer. vi. 1, and by scribal error has become Beth-kar, 1 S. vii. 11. It is also presupposed by Karmi in 1 Chr. iv. 1 (where Karmi corresponds to Kelubai and Kaleb in 1 Chr. ii. 9, 18). (*c*) We find the name Ḳedem in the phrases 'the sons, land, mountains of Ḳedem' ('the east' is, of course, inadmissible).[1] This is a further modification of Reḳem, and though seemingly a scribal error, may have arisen very early from causes on which it would be vain to speculate. In Judg. vi. 3, 33, vii. 12, 'the Amalekites' (= Jerahmeelites—see p. xxx) is inserted as a gloss.

(*d*) Aram (Assyrian, Arimi, Aramu) is familiar to us as the name of a land and people to the N.E. of Palestine. But it is also, as recent scholars agree, the name of an Arabian people. This Hommel infers[2] from Gen. x. 23, xxii. 21. I should hesitate myself to assign these Arammites to 'a large part of Arabia' on Biblical grounds; the traditions of Israel seem to me to point more definitely to N. Arabia as the original seat of this people. In Num. xxiii. 7 we find 'Aram' parallel to 'the mountains of Ḳedem,' and Ḳedem, as we have just seen, is an early modification of Reḳem, *i.e.* Jarḥam. That Balaam was a N. Arabian soothsayer, has surely been proved.[3] As to the name Aram, we can hardly

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 179, 200, 372; *E. Bib.*, 'East, Children of'; 'Rekem.'

[2] *Grundriss*, p. 188.

[3] *T. and B.* pp. 40 (n. 3), 41, 179, 190, 314, 430.

doubt its connexion with Jerahmeel (cp. Shem = Ishmael; Sheth = Ashtar). A shorter form is Ram (in 1 Chr. ii. 9, brother of Jerahmeel and Kelubai). We have it in the patriarchal name Abram, which is doubtless equivalent to Abraham; at least, no other equally probable account can be given of these two forms than that 'rām' comes from 'Aram,' and 'raham' from 'raḥam,' *i.e.* Jarḥam. The name Aram must have gone northward in the migration. In Amos ix. 7 the Arammites (who follow Israel and the 'Philistines') are said to have been brought (by Yahweh) from Ḳir or (see 𝔊) Ḳor; possibly Ashḥur in the wider sense is meant. From another point of view one might place Ḳir 'somewhere in S. Babylonia on the Elamite border.'[1]

(*e*) There remains Javan (= Jaman). The identification, so widely accepted, of Javanites with Ionians, seems to be only tenable in Dan. viii. 21, x. 20, xi. 2, and even here the question arises whether in an earlier, underlying form of the Book of Daniel[2] the name Javan may not have had a different meaning. Everywhere else, at any rate, Javan can be shown to have sprung either from Jerahmeel or from Ishmael. For the O.T. passages, and such criticism as was possible to me when the article was written, reference may be permitted to 'Javan' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. In my later works[3] the best explanation known to me was pointed out more and more clearly. It was added that the Jamani who displaced Sargon's nominee as king of Ashdod (p. xvi) may have been, like other adventurers (*e.g.* Omri, Zimri, Tibni), a N. Arabian.[4] This will gain in probability if the Jamnai whom Sargon (*KB* ii. 43) 'drew like a fish from the midst of the sea' can in any sense be N. Arabians. And why should they not be? It seems clear that the N. Arabians, in their migrations, carried their names with them, and in the present case it is noteworthy that one name for Phœnicia till quite late times was most probably Jām,

[1] Šanda, *Die Aramäer* (in *Der Alte Orient*, iv. 3), p. 8.

[2] *T. and B.* pp. 159 (n. 2), 160.

[3] *Crit. Bib.* Part II. (1903), p. 104; cp. Part I. p. 48; *T. and B.* pp. 6 (n. 3), 160 *f.*, 210.

[4] Winckler suggests Jemen as his origin (*Muṣri, Meluḫḫa, Ma'in*, p. 26, n. 1).

i.e. Jaman (= Javan). The equation Jām = Jāman is by no means arbitrary. In the Hebrew Bible, as I have pointed out elsewhere,[1] Jām is sometimes a shortened form of Jāmān, and it is difficult to resist the view, which (taken in connexion with certain parallel theories) smooths over exegetical difficulties, that in Phœnician inscriptions too Jām means Jaman ('Zidon of the sea' should be 'Zidon of Jaman'). I hold, therefore (after E. Robertson), that the Jamnai of Sargon are the Phœnician inhabitants of Arvad, which was an insular city,[2] and support this by the similar figurative phraseology of Ashurbanipal (*KB* iii. 170, n. 2).

It is true, Robertson gives the theory a different setting.[3] He is of opinion that the original Javanites were that highly civilised people which preceded the Semites in Babylonia, whence, as he thinks, they spread to the Mediterranean, and became known as the Ionians; while some settled in Phœnicia, and 'developed that navigation which they had learned on the Lower Euphrates and Persian Gulf.' The theory, as proposed by Robertson, has a wide basis, taking in the Ἰάονες of Greek and the Javana of Sanskrit literature. Whether the facts adduced are all relevant may be matter for debate. The result which appears to me the most satisfactory is based solely on the Hebrew, the Phœnician, and the Assyrian evidence. Except in our present text of the Book of Daniel, Javan or Jaman is equivalent to Jerahmeel or Ishmael.

It is now time to refer briefly to the corruptions of the name Ishmael. I give a larger number than in the case of Jerahmeel, because Ishmael has not taken so much hold on my critics as the parallel name. Here, then, are some of those disclosed by the new methods,—ישמע, שמע, שבא, שמען, שובל, שבואל, שמואל, שפן, צפון, צפירן, צבען, זבל, ישן, שונם, שמן, יבם, יבש. The only remark on these names that I can allow myself is this,—that a considerable number of theories (*e.g.* the existence of traces of totemism in the O.T.,[4] and

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 44 *f.*

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Arvad.'

[3] 'Notes on Javan,' *Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1908, pp. 466-508.

[4] Prof. Witton Davies states in his article (p. 704) that the present writer 'nowhere shows the slightest interest in totemism.' A reference to the index (*s.v.* Totemism) will disprove this hasty statement.

the mention of the north pole as the seat of the supreme God)[1] are shown by a keen criticism of the names to be fallacious. For further information I may refer to passages in the present work and in *Traditions and Beliefs*, and for the name Simeon to *T. and B.* p. 375, and Meyer's *Die Isr.* p. 425.

I trust that I have not exhausted the patience of my readers. I would far sooner have refrained from anti-criticism, but the injury done to the cause of free inquiry was too great. My anti-criticism, however, has not excluded explanation ; indeed, it has to some extent facilitated it. I will now venture to ask, What are the most probable reasons for the violent and uncomprehending opposition to these researches ?

The reason that I shall mention first is by no means devoid of plausibility. It is that some may question the possibility of solving so many problems by a single key. This I meet by the admission that all pioneers are liable to go too far. Aware of this, I have not waited for helpers, but have to a large extent criticised myself. And yet, even after this, a huge number of cases remain, in which the only complete explanation of the problems cannot be ignored. Is there no consideration which may conciliate opponents, and induce them not to go on ignoring ? There is. It is plain that when Samaria was taken the catastrophe which ensued was not only political but literary. What was saved of the N. Israelitish records must have been scanty in extent, and the S. Israelites or Judaites did not care to preserve it except in a mutilated, confused, and altered form. Hence by far the greater part of the extant literary monuments of ancient Israel are precisely those monuments whose producers were most preoccupied by N. Arabia. This is why the history both of Israel and of Judah has found such a one-sided representation in the Old Testament. This, too, is why the N. Arabian key has plausibly solved so many problems that critics who have not gone deeply enough into the matter are repelled. Had a different class

[1] On *ṣafon* see passages referred to in the index of this work and of *T. and B.*; also Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 23 ; Zimmern, *KAT*, pp. 352 *f.*

of documents been transmitted, the N. Arabian key might not have equally fitted the new problems.

VII

Still the repugnance to progress on these lines would not be quite so keen but for some additional reasons. These are:—1. The opinion of conservative critics that the results to which the multitude of new facts (or asserted facts) seem to lead are intrinsically improbable. Prof. H. P. Smith,[1] for instance, has said a great deal on this head, and asked many questions which we have not the means of answering. But this scholar and those who go with him seem to have approached the study of the new theories at the wrong end. Sound method requires us to begin with the facts, and only after a sufficiently long and unprejudiced study of details can we venture either to maintain or to oppose a historical theory. We must not say with Olmstead [2] that 'we are naturally prejudiced against such a theory.' Imperfectly known truth always appears improbable, but it cannot be natural to a candid student to meet any theory based on real or, at least, asserted facts with a dogmatic denial suggested in the first instance by prejudice.

2. The second reason is that the textual critics of the day do not probe the Hebrew, and, one may add, the Septuagint text, half deeply enough, and lack that wide acquaintance with the textual phenomena, the habits of the scribes and editors, and recurring types of corruption, which has to be superadded to the practice of the older critical methods.[3] This must surely be the case with Professor Witton Davies in the *Review of Theology*,[4] who falls into the error of supposing me not to 'bother myself about versions,' and with Prof. Gordon of Montreal, who, with unconscious arrogance, speaks of my work as 'unfortunately dominated

[1] *American Journal of Theology*, October 1907.
[2] *Sargon of Assyria*, p. 60.
[3] Cheyne, *Crit. Bib.* Part I. (1903), pp. 3 *f.*
[4] Article on *T. and B.*, May 1908, p. 696.

by peculiar textual principles.'[1] Until the old methods fail, I am heartily with these scholars and with their teachers. But I certainly am convinced that the old methods, including the old method of using the versions, will not go far to help us with really hard problems.

3. The third is that these critics seem to mix up conceptions of their functions which ought to be kept distinct. I mean that they seem to have no clear idea of the *twofold* task devolving upon them, viz. first to find out the meaning which the latest ancient editors put upon the text which they had themselves corrected, and next, to get as near as possible to the underlying original text and its meaning. It is of no use to try to perform both these duties simultaneously. The result can only be a form of text which, as a whole, never existed, and a largely imaginary exegesis. The traditional text has its own historical rights, and so also have the fragments of the original text which may still be detected underlying the text transmitted by a late tradition.

But let us now return to the first-mentioned reason for the vehemence of the opposition to progress on the new lines. I spoke of the probability that the new key has been applied somewhat too often. More than this I cannot say, for the pioneering work has in a multitude of cases been fully justified, and not unfrequently, even if the solution offered was incorrect, the pioneer was nevertheless on the way to truth. I venture to add that a pioneer of criticism would not be worth his salt if he did not sometimes go too far. It is in the interests of critical study that some one should at first make the utmost of a new theory. Winckler is, I think, unwise in not always doing this, when the correction of the text is concerned. Without a more consistent and methodical criticism of the text I do not see how his historical constructions can be defended in all points against the enemy.

But what is to be done if both Winckler's Babylonian and my own N. Arabian theory are rejected? It is, of course, far too late to seek shelter with Gesenius and Ewald! Shall we be content with a strictly moderate

[1] *The Early Traditions of Genesis* (1907), p. viii.

Babylonian theory, using Babylonian illustrations for exegesis, and drawing on the Assyrian lexicon for the explanation of strange-looking Biblical words? Our newer dictionaries and commentaries betoken a growing tendency towards such a course. I do not believe, however, that it will suit the conditions of the case. For an example take Amos v. 26, where Nowack, adopting just such a moderate theory, renders, 'Therefore shall ye take up Sakkuth your king, and Kēwān, your images which ye made for yourselves, and . . .' We may, however, safely decide that a by-name of the god Ninib (himself nowhere mentioned in the O.T.), would not be handed down in a Hebrew prophecy.[1] Nor is there any passage of Amos which refers to the worship of Assyrian gods by the Israelites. And even if this argument were repelled, how could the carrying away of Assyrian gods by captive Israelites into Assyria be put forward in a threat?[2]

From the strictly moderate point of view here indicated, many other O.T. passages might be provisionally illustrated. One might, for instance, utilise the suggestions of Winckler for Gen. xiv. and Judg. v., and those of other critics for the Book of Nahum and other parts of the O.T. But I have not the requisite space to enter into further detail, and I hope that the reader will see that one whom Giesebrecht has attacked for being too courteous and respectful to Winckler is not likely to cavil at Babylonian or Assyrian explanations of Hebrew difficulties, when they are in a high degree plausible. Only too often, however, I am brought into contact with some preliminary textual problem, the solution of which by new and more adequate methods removes the ground for reference to Babylon. So far as I can as yet see, it is only now and then that the textual critic derives undeniable assistance from the inscriptions.

[1] On the question of a Ninib cultus in ancient Palestine see Zimmern, *KAT*[3], pp. 410 *f.*; Pinches, 'Was Ninib the "Most High God" of Jerusalem?' *PSBA*, June 1894; Budde, *Buch der Richter* (in *KHC*) p. 15.

[2] From the earlier point of view, *E. Bib.*, 'Amos,' § 13; 'Chiun and Siccuth'; Muss-Arnolt, *Expositor*, ii., n.s., pp. 414 *ff.* (1903).

VIII

The most striking instances of such assistance are passages in which Mizraim has been misread (*i.e.* mispointed) for Mizrim, or Zōr misread for Mizzōr (Mizrim and Mizzōr both meaning the N. Arabian Muzri), or Mizri, Mizrim, misinterpreted as 'Egyptian,' 'Egyptians.' The passages referred to are (1) Gen. x. 6, xiii. 10, xvi. 1, xxi. 21, l. 11, 1 Sam. xxx. 13, 2 Sam. xxiii. 13, 1 K. iii. 1, xi. 18, 40, Isa. xx. 3, Am. i. 9, Isa. xliii. 3, xlv. 14, Joel iv. 19, Ps. lx. 11, lxxxvii. 4; (2) Gen. xxv. 3, Lev. xxiv. 10, 1 K. iv. 30 (v. 10), x. 28 *f.*, xiv. 25, 2 K. vii. 6, Isa. xxx. 2, xxxi. 1, Ezek. xvi. 26, xxviii., Ps. lxxxiii. 8, and other passages; (3) Gen. xii. 10-20, xxxvii. 25, 28, 36, xxxix. 1, etc., 1 K. vii. 13 *f.*, 2 K. xxiii. 29, etc., Isa. xix., Ezek. xxvi., xxvii., xxix.-xxxii. Of these three classes the first contains nearly all the most obvious cases of the misreading (Mizraim); it is the list offered by Winckler.[1] The second, those which require in general a little more explanation than the preceding ones. The third, those which originally referred to Mizrim, but have been manipulated by editors so as to seem to refer to Mizraim. Manipulation has done its utmost in the story of Joseph. I might also have included the story of the Exodus, which in its original form probably referred to Mizrim in N. Arabia. This, however, is so contrary to traditional opinions that, in this highly condensed essay, I refrain.[2]

The textual evidence is of considerable value as supplementing the too scanty details of the inscriptions. At the same time, we cannot say that the Hebrew writers coincide altogether with the Assyrian scribes. I may here state briefly, on the basis of Winckler, what it is that these scribes partly state, partly seem to imply. Their references to Muzri in N. Arabia occur from the time of Tiglath-Pileser III. to that of Esarhaddon;[3] the king of Muzri seems to

[1] *KAT*, pp. 144 *f.* For the other passages see Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, pp. 167-178; Hommel, *Aufsätze*, pp. 304 *f.*

[2] On the Exodus passages see Cheyne, *T. and B.*

[3] See Winckler, *KAT*, pp. 150 *f.*

have been, subsequently to the fall of the Assyrian *kêpu*, the vassal of the king of Meluḫa, or, more correctly, Ma'în (the Minæan empire). Danger constantly beset the N. Arabian kingdoms from Assyria. Among these was the people or state called Aribi on the east of Muzri, whose *queens* were brought to acknowledge the suzerainty of Assyria; its capital may have been Têma.[1] This was in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III. Under Ashurbanipal we meet with the Ḳidri (Ḳedar) and the Nabaiati (Nebaioth) by the side of Aribi. It is a natural inference from what is said in the inscriptions that the kingdom of Muzri was involved in the misfortunes which shortly after befell the Minæan empire, and that the Ḳidri and the Nabaiati, with perhaps other tribes, settled in the region once known as Muzri. It must be remembered, however, that in Gen. xxv. 13 Nebaioth and Ḳedar appear as Ishmaelite tribes,[2] and that between Ishmaelites and Jerahmeelites there was no marked difference.

Of the history of the Arabian Kush still less can be said.[3] This region is certainly referred to in the inscriptions of Esar-haddon, but only four times. Was it in S. or in N. Arabia? The name may perhaps have had a variable significance. Esar-haddon speaks of 'the people of Kûsi and Muzur,' which apparently means S. and N. Arabia. Some of my own textual results, however, point rather to N. than to S. Arabia as the seat of the Kushites, and considering that the name Achish (Akish) seems to be closely related to Ashḫur, and that there was probably, according to Hebrew writers, both a nearer and a more distant Ashḫur, the question arises, whether Ashḫur and Kush may not have had the same origin, and have been nearly or quite equivalent. Eduard Meyer, consistently enough, denies the Arabian Kush, but he is ably answered by Winckler, who of course explains the identity of the names of Ethiopia and S. Arabia by the naïve geographical views of early ages (see p. xix).

[1] Winckler, *l.c.* For the Aram. inscription of Têma see Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 196-199.

[2] It is true, the twelve sons of Ishmael are from P. But P's source need not have been post-exilic. [3] See Winckler, *KAT*, pp. 144 *f.*

There is a fairly large group of passages in which the N. Arabian Kush is probably or certainly referred to, viz. Gen. ii. 13, x. 6, Num. xii. 1, Judg. ii. 10, 2 Sam. xviii. 21, 2 K. xix. 9, Isa. xviii. 1, xx. 3, xliii. 3, xlv. 14, Hab. iii. 7, Zeph. ii. 12, iii. 10, Ps. lxxxvii. 4, 2 Chr. xiv. 9, xxi. 16. For explanations I may refer to my own recent works, as well as to those of Professors Winckler and Hommel. It may be added here that the phrase 'king of Kush,'[1] and similarly the phrases 'king of Mizrim,' 'king of Aram,' 'king of Asshur,' and perhaps 'king of Kush,' were used archaistically even after the political situation had altered. This seems to me the only way to reconcile the statements of the inscriptions with the results of a thorough textual criticism.

The conclusion at which we are arriving is that a full N. Arabian theory, suggested and helped by the cuneiform inscriptions, together with a keen textual criticism, can contribute most to the solution of our textual and historical problems. And if any further proof is needed, it will be the wreckage which strews the shores of 'moderate' criticism. A whole volume would be required to indicate these critical failures in detail, but a few instances seem to be not uncalled for. Let us begin with the Book of Genesis. The most recent commentator[2] makes this remark on the 'short tribal poem' in Gen. ix. 25-27 :—

'It is difficult to understand how a poem of that date (the early monarchy) could still look back upon the Canaanites as "brethren" (*v.* 25). The tendency at that period was rather to obliterate all trace of their kinship. . . . For a period when the term "brother" could be applied to Canaan we must go beyond the Exodus and the wars between Israel and Canaan that followed it. In this respect no time seems so suitable as the Amarna period, when Israel and Canaan fought side by side against their Egyptian overlords.'

The improbability of this view is manifest. A real monument of the nomadic period (as Gordon supposes the song to be) would have had much more colour than the

[1] See *Crit. Bib.* pp. 383 *f.*

[2] Gordon, *The Early Traditions of Genesis* (1907), p. 183.

song, at any rate in its present form, can be said to possess. The true solution of the problem must take account of the facts already mentioned respecting Shem and Ham, and of the other fact (which is a result of wide textual observation) that אחיו is not unfrequently a corruption of אשחור.[1]

I may also refer to the Ur-kasdim problem. As Prof. Meyer points out, Gen. xxiv. 4, 10 expressly states that Abraham's country from which he migrated (Gen. xii. 1) was Aram-naharaim. At any rate, such is the reading of the present text. But according to Gen. xi. 31, xv. 7, the patriarch's starting-point was Ur-kasdim, *i.e.*, as we are told, but without sufficient proof, the old Babylonian city of Uru. Prof. Meyer[2] evades the difficulty by the supposition that the ancestors of Abraham belonged to Babylonia, not he himself. This solution, however, is arbitrary, and the full difficulty of the statement in Gen. xi. 31 (as this passage is usually interpreted) is not even hinted at by this scholar. For a full setting forth the student is referred to the *Encyclopædia Biblica* ('Ur of the Chaldees'), where the N. Arabian theory suggests an adequate solution, which, in a modified form, is further justified in *Traditions and Beliefs* (see below). The riddle of Arpakshad (Gen. x. 22) is equally baffling to the current criticism. It is closely connected with the problem of Ur-kasdim, as Hommel, though not Prof. Meyer, is fully aware. It is usual[3] to invoke the help of the Arabic lexicon, but the true origin is plain as soon as we throw off the prejudice against the new theory. אור is from אר', *i.e.* either ארם, or, better, ערב, and ארפ (in ארפכשד) is from ערב. כשד in the latter word is from כשדים, and this from כשרם, *i.e.* אשחר ארם. For further explanations see *T. and B.* pp. 178, 214.

1 Sam. ii. 36 (as the text stands) spoils the prophecy. Nor is any great improvement effected by appending יהוה, and so eliminating the troublesome word פת. The passage must be studied as a whole, and suggestions taken both from the N. Arabian theory and from one of the famous

[1] See *T. and B.* p. 153.

[2] *Die Israeliten*, p. 284 (n. 1). Gordon's suggestion (*Early Traditions*, p. 174) is less arbitrary, but also less plausible.

[3] So Gordon, *ETG*, p. 322.

Elephantine papyri, which throws a flood of light on an important problem. See p. 24, n. 1.

The last two words of 1 Sam. x. 27 have caused much perplexity. We have been told that certain discontented Israelites brought the new king no presents. Then follow the words, מחריש, וידי, which is thought to mean, 'and he (Saul) made as though he did not observe it.' There are several corrections of the text, but none of them very plausible. Is it not therefore time to appeal to a new theory for a new suggestion? The suggestion, when methodically carried out, seems to me altogether adequate. It is that וידי כמחריש comes from והוא בחשרם, and that this is a gloss on 'Jabesh-gilead,' indicating that this Jabesh was not in the trans-Jordanic Gilead, but in an Asshurite region which was also called Gilead. This result throws a fresh light on the impossible words ואחר שמואל in xi. 7. That Samuel took part in Saul's enterprise cannot be maintained (see 1 Sam. x. 7). The words should be ואשחר ישמעאל, which ought to follow ישראל, or perhaps, omitting the ו, to be substituted for ישראל.

Among the other highly corrupt passages in 1 Samuel, I may at least mention xv. 9, which I cannot bring myself to think that Wellhausen has healed. Why should it be emphasised that the oxen were 'fat,' when just before the narrator has referred to 'the best' of the cattle? Why should the synonymous terms נבזה and נמאסת be combined? And why is כרים left uncorrected, considering that in the parallel passages, *vv.* 15 and 21, the lambs are not mentioned? And considering, further, that in *v.* 20 (cp. *v.* 8) the 'devotion by slaughter' (החרים) is mentioned with express and undeniable reference to the Amalekites, are we justified in retaining unaltered the latter part of our *v.* 8, the phraseology of which is itself peculiar enough to encourage emendation? To me Wellhausen's treatment of the text seems superficial and unsatisfactory. But grant that the Amalekites were a branch of the Jerahmeelites, and that Jerahmeel (or Jarḥam) and Ishmael are equivalent (see p. xxviii), and suitable corrections at once suggest themselves. כרים, like כרם (p. xxxiv), represents ירחם (Jarḥam), משנים comes from שמנים, *i.e.* יִשְׁמְנִים (see p. xxxvi), מלאכ׳ from

נמאלים (= Jerahmeelites), נמבז and נמס from [שמנ]ים. See *Crit. Bib.* pp. 222 *f.*; *T. and B.* p. 59.

I cannot attempt to be exhaustive, but must at least refer to some of the prophets. Amos ii. 6 is a testing passage, and I am afraid that the old methods alone will not enable us to explain the difficulties. The A.V. makes Yahweh threaten Israel with an irreversible punishment,[1] 'because they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes.' Explanations of this are numerous, but who can help feeling that neither 'for silver' nor 'for a pair of shoes' is natural; the one is weak, the other grotesque. The N. Arabian theory, however, suggests probable corrections of the text which bring the lines into perfect parallelism. What one expects is regional names, such as Kasram and 'Arab-Jerahme'el (cp. on Isa. xlviii. 10, p. 144), which should be substituted for כסף and עבור נעלים respectively.

Another such passage is Amos iii. 12, which the A.V. renders thus, 'As the shepherd taketh out of the mouth of the lion two legs, or a piece of an ear, so shall the children of Israel be taken out that dwell in Samaria in the corner of a bed, and in Damascus in a couch.' 'A piece of an ear' is very odd; were the ears of the goats referred to specially large? And does בדל really mean 'piece,' and דמשק 'damask' (so Harper)? The N. Arabian theory gives the only remedy (see *Hibbert Journal*, July 1905, p. 831).

I will only cite one more passage of Amos (ix. 11). It is at the opening of the epilogue, and runs thus in the A.V., 'In that day will I raise up the tabernacle (lit., booth) of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof.' Elsewhere in the epilogue the style is quite clear; how, then, came the writer to use at the outset such an obscure expression (Amos ix. 11) as 'the booth of David that is fallen down'? The explanations are very various, but none is satisfactory. How can a booth have 'breaches' like a walled city? But are the points of סֻכַּת right? Referring to *T. and B.* p. 397, should we not read סַכַּת, *i.e.* סלכת (see on Deut. iii. 10)? In this case דויד should be דוד, which

[1] Prof. Hogg's plausible explanation of לא אשיבנו, 'I will not turn him (*i.e.* the dreaded invader) back, deserves notice, however.'

was a regional as well as a divine name (*T. and B.* p. 47). The idea is that when Salekath, that important city of the N. Arabian border-land, has been reoccupied by the Israelites and rebuilt, it will be easy for them to subjugate all the border-kingdoms.

Much more might be added to show the unsatisfactory state of the current criticism of the O.T., and the help which the new methods, largely directed by the N. Arabian theory, are able to give. My limits, however, compel me to condense, and in my recent works, including (particularly for Jeremiah) the present work, there are many things which may serve to fill up the *lacunæ* of this essay. I may, however, call attention again to two or three passages in the obscure Book of Habakkuk.[1] That nothing can be made of לא נמות at the end of i. 12 *a* is generally admitted. Marti would therefore remove these words to the margin, as a gloss to *v.* 12 *b*. But is such a gloss needed? Surely נמות has come from תמון, *i.e.* תמול, which is often a corruption of ישמעאל. The two disputed words are a gloss on the corrupt word מעקל (*v.* 4), which should be קמאל (cp. קמואל). 'Is it not Ishmael' is a perfectly correct gloss, ירחמאל (underlying מ׳) and ישמעאל being equivalent.

A similar case meets us in Hab. ii. 2. ובאר has not, so far as I know, been really explained. The same word occurs in Deut. i. 5, xxvii. 8, on which see at a later point (pp. 135, 154). ובאר has probably come from הוא עֲרָב, 'that is Arabia,' a gloss on ירחמאל underlying קרא בו. The preceding words לְמַעַן יָרוּץ should be ל יֵרוֹץ, so that the sense produced is, 'in order that Jerahmeel may be broken.' It is, in fact, not the Chaldæans but the Asshur-Jerahmeelites from whom the danger of invasion threatens. Let us now pass on to the series of woes in chap. ii. Nothing can possibly be made of ואף כי היין בוגד (*v.* 5). היין should surely be היוני, 'the Javanite'; the Javan meant is in Arabia (see p. xxxv). Similarly in Hos. iv. 11 יין should doubtless be יון; the whole verse, when corrected, runs thus, 'Shamnith of Javan and Ashtar take away the understanding.' And again, in Isa. xxviii. 1 הלומי יין probably comes from ירחמאל יון (glosses); see p. 88, n. 1.

[1] 'Criticism of Habakkuk,' *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1907.

It must now be plain that there are excellent reasons for a far-reaching and yet methodical treatment of the text, and in my opinion, to guard in some measure against arbitrariness, it is well to have some external check. Such a check is supplied by the N. Arabian theory, and considering the great results which the new critical methods, directed by that theory, have produced, it seems to me impossible that the hypothesis should be wholly wrong. No doubt some clever scholar, making use of freshly discovered facts, may be able to improve it, and that is why I appealed to fellow-students (not to judges) for a help which has hardly as yet been given. None of us is infallible; why, then, should not both Professor Winckler and I, and even our critics, have made many mistakes? As Professor William James well says,[1] 'The wisest of critics is an altering being, subject to the better insight of the morrow, and right, at any moment, only "up to date" and "on the whole." When larger ranges of truth open, it is surely best to be able to open ourselves to their reception, unfettered by our previous pretensions.' It is these previous pretensions which seem to me among the greatest hindrances, both in the pursuit of truth and in the fair estimation of the work of pioneers. And which of us has not made such pretensions? Let us then have the courage to confess that many of them probably were mistaken pretensions, and be thankful to those who shake us out of our slumber.

[1] *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 333.

PART I

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY—FROM HEZEKIAH TO JOSIAH

FEW things are more uncertain than the exact course of the history of Judah from the time of Hezekiah to the fall of Jerusalem, and few subjects raise more difficult questions. Did the king of Assyria in the time of Hezekiah really perform all that by the common interpretation of the Hebrew traditions is ascribed to him? Did Hezekiah, like Josiah, initiate and complete a considerable religious reformation? Was Manasseh really carried captive to the city called Bābel, and if so, what was the country in which this city was situated? What was the nature of the religious reaction connected with the name of Manasseh? Did Josiah really go to Megiddo, and contend with a king of Egypt on his way to the Euphrates, or has there been some misunderstanding of the original tradition? What was the nature of Josiah's reformation, and how far, geographically, did it extend? Who was the great enemy of the kings of Judah after Jehoahaz? or were there more such enemies than one?

Into the hard questions relating to Hezekiah and Manasseh I cannot at present enter, though later on I shall have to refer to some plausible results of criticism. It is Josiah and his successors who just now claim our attentions, though for the sake of Josiah's reformation I must refer in passing to that of Hezekiah. But, first of all, to clear the air of some prejudices, let me recall the fact that religious innovations are not uncommon in the history of Babylonia and Assyria, while in that of Egypt we can refer particularly to the well-known religious revolution of Khu-en-aten (Amenhotep IV.). For examples of the former one may mention

the supremacy accorded to Marduk, the god of the city of Babylon, by Hammurabi, and the overshadowing and ignoring of Nabû. Also the reaction, under the Assyrian king Adad-nirari III., against Marduk in favour of Nabû, indicated by the inscription on a consecrated statue—'Trust in Nabû, trust not in another God.'

Let us now turn to Hezekiah. Tradition is on the whole unusually communicative respecting his reign. The same remark may indeed be made with regard to the reign of Josiah, but whereas in the case of this king warlike matters have but slight and religious matters very extended mention, in Hezekiah's it is religion which on the whole comes rather short, while a foreign invasion is related with much particularity. According to the statement of 2 K. xviii. 3-6 Hezekiah was a fervent puritan, and abolished the time-honoured sanctuaries where the cult was polytheistic, with the accompanying sacred objects; he is also said to have broken in pieces a famous serpent of bronze, to which, as inhabited by a divinity, the people still offered sacrifice. It is reasonable to assume that some historical fact lies at the foundation of this statement; in particular, the tradition of the destruction of the sacred serpent (see special note 1) has every appearance of truth. But exactly when this reform movement took place, and to what extent it proceeded, we can hardly conjecture. According to some,[1] it was a kind of thank-offering to Yahweh for the withdrawal of Sennacherib from Jerusalem, and was promoted by the preaching of the prophet Isaiah. The Assyrian inscriptions, however, say nothing about this withdrawal. This may of course be due to accident, but it is also possible that the Hebrew redactor fell into a confusion between two invasions, that of an Assyrian and that of a N. Arabian Asshurite king. What the inscriptions do mention is a punitive mutilation of the territory of Judah by Sennacherib, and this (if it was carried out) was hardly calculated to dispose the king and

[1] Stade, *GVI* i. 623; W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, p. 359; Cheyne, *Introd. to the Bk. of Isaiah*, p. 165; M'Curdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, ii. 385. For other views, see Cheyne, *E. Bib.*, 'Hezekiah,' § 2; 'Isaiah,' § 15; Winckler, *KAT*(3), pp. 271 *f.* (the reform after Sennacherib's second expedition to the West).

people of Judah to adopt the practice of a purified Yahwism. Such an event would appear to them to show that Yahweh's power was limited, and that he could not save them from a powerful and determined enemy.

The Chronicler, however, has no scruple in exaggerating to the utmost what little he may have learned from tradition (2 Chr. xxix. 3-xxxi. 1). According to him, Hezekiah was to a large extent the forerunner of Josiah, and anticipated the remedies for the religious abuses applied by that king, with this important exception—that Hezekiah's measures are not related to have been taken on the authority of an ancient law-book. The Chronicler's narrative, however, is obviously not history; it is rather a development of what is related in 2 K. xviii. 4 *a*, and it serves as an explanation of the prosperity ascribed by the Chronicler to Hezekiah. Here, said this pious writer, is an opportunity of proving on a grand scale that righteousness exalteth a king as well as a nation. The law-books of antiquity bid the Israelites break the idols of Canaan in pieces, and abolish all heathen symbols (Ex. xxiii. 24, xxxiv. 13, Dt. vii. 5, xii. 2 *f.*). Surely there must have been some kings of the Davidic line who carried out these iconoclastic injunctions and were rewarded for it. The most exemplary of these kings, according to the Chronicler, were Hezekiah and Josiah.

This view of history appeared to the Chronicler to be supported by the contrasted fortunes of the royal representatives of Yahwism and of Baalism respectively. Hezekiah, for instance, opposed the Baalistic or N. Arabian type of religion, and was recompensed by a marked interposition of Yahweh against the 'camp of Asshur.'[1] His son Manasseh, on the other hand, supported a religious reaction, and was punished by an invasion of his land by the same warlike king, and by his own captivity in the chief city of his conqueror[2] (2 Chr. xxxiii. 11). Josiah returned to the courses of Hezekiah, whom in fact he outdid, and was

[1] 2 K. xix. 35. The king referred to, as one must on the whole believe, ruled over Asshur or Ashḥur, one of whose vassals was the king of Miṣrim.

[2] Why this is not mentioned in 2 K. is a secret of the last redactor.

rewarded by a long period of peace.[1] His son Jehoiakim restored the old 'abominations' (2 Chr. xxxvi. 8; cp. 2 K. xxiii. 37), and received his retribution (virtually) at the hands of the victorious king of Babel.[2]

Between Manasseh and Josiah in the list of kings of Judah comes Amon, who is said by the chronologist to have reigned two years. Just so, between Josiah and Jehoiakim comes another son of Josiah, Jehoahaz, who is credited with a reign of but three months. Amon continues the religious policy of Manasseh; Jehoahaz is the religious forerunner of Jehoiakim. Amon is assassinated; Jehoahaz is carried captive to the land of Miṣrim (see chap. v.). To this unfortunate king we shall return later; we are now more concerned with his father. Tradition says that the 'people of the land,' *i.e.* the freemen at large, slew the assassins of Amon, and made his son Josiah king in his stead, *i.e.* perhaps, confirmed the claim of the latter prince to the succession.[3] Josiah is said to have been only eight years old on his accession (2 K. xxii. 1, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 1). The original text, however, may perhaps have said 'eighteen years.'[4] We can hardly suppose that the assassins of Amon were religious reformers, and anticipated the accession of a mere child under the tutelage of the leaders of the reforming party. On the other hand, if 'eighteen' is correct, Amon must have come to the throne earlier than 2 K. xxii. 19 states.

Only two events are recorded (from different sources) in the reign of Josiah, his reformation and his ill-fated encounter with a foreign king. Nothing is said of any embassy being sent on his accession to the potent king who had made Manasseh his prisoner (2 Chr. xxxiii. 11); nothing too of the counsellors who were at the helm of the state during the king's childhood (accepting the 'eight years'). Did Josiah fall at once into the moulding hands of the friends of

[1] It is of course adverse to the orthodox view that Josiah fell fighting against an enemy.

[2] Asshur and Bābel are, when N. Arabia is concerned, equivalent. See 2 Chr. xxxiii. 11.

[3] Of course, there may have been a son of Amon by another wife, who might have succeeded, but was passed over, just as Jehoiakim was passed over on the first vacancy.

[4] So Klostermann and Stade.

Yahwism? And what were the political results of this tutelage?

The Chronicler, after his manner, fills up the gap with an account of a religious movement. In the eighth year of his reign Josiah 'began to be zealous for the God of David his father,' and in the twelfth to 'purge Judah and Jerusalem' (2 Chr. xxxiv. 3). It so happens that—if the accepted chronology is correct—the twelfth year of king Josiah was the death-year of the last great Assyrian king—Ashurbanipal (B.C. 626). The change which this event marks in the fortunes of Assyria may, as Erbt thinks,[1] have encouraged the advisers of the young king to initiate a reform movement. It is possible indeed that the 'book of *tōrah*' was brought forward in the eighteenth year, but surely the root and branch reform ascribed to Josiah must have taken longer than would appear from the account in 2 K. May not the movement really have begun in the twelfth year? This is indeed only an ingenious surmise, and may, to some, appear discredited by its connexion with the Chronicler. Still intelligent surmises are often called for, and may we not—must we not—believe that the Chronicler had access to and used, even if uncritically, older historical sources? His facts may sometimes be right, even if the setting or the colouring is wrong.[2]

[1] *Die Sicherstellung des Monotheismus*, pp. 4-6.

[2] On the problems of the reign of Josiah, cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Josiah.'

CHAPTER II

THE STORY OF THE FINDING OF THE BOOK

LET us now turn to a narrative much more likely *a priori* to contain historical elements (2 K. xxii. 3-xxiii. 25). It opens with an account of the reparation of the temple (*vv.* 3-7, 9) which is meagre in details, and consequently obscure. We must not, however, omit to refer to it here in conjunction with the story of the reparation of the temple by Jehoash in 2 K. xii. 4-16. The two stories are in fact closely parallel, and it is very surprising (1) that the kings of Judah should have repeatedly allowed their own sanctuary to get so thoroughly out of repair, and (2) that the narrators of both reparations should have worked on the same model.

The most probable explanation appears to be that in both cases the story of the reparation of the temple is an imaginative addition to the story of the destruction of heathenism.[1] The Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reformation is not without a faint trace of a similar supplement. In 2 Chr. xxix. 3 it is said that in the first year of his reign, in the first month, Hezekiah opened the doors of the house of Yahweh (which had been shut up by Ahaz), and repaired them. Nothing of this kind is ascribed to Hezekiah in 2 Kings, nor to the reforming king Asa either in Kings or in Chronicles, but we do hear, in both, of the dedicated vessels of silver and gold which Asa brought into the house of Yahweh. Altogether it would seem as if the narrators felt that merely to uproot bad religious growths was not enough; for a king to win his full meed of praise he must

[1] So in the main Erbt, *OLZ*, Feb. 15, 1908.

be shown to have rendered some signal service to the sanctuary of the true God.

The account of the 'finding' of the Book and of the subsequent religious revolution is much more full of circumstantial details. We must, however, be on our guard, and not assume that the traditional story has altogether escaped imaginative expansion or redactional manipulation. A moderate view of the redactor's alterations will be found in Prof. Kittel's Commentary. It is there pointed out that 'high priest' (xxii. 8, etc.) should be 'priest,' that the close of *v.* 18 has been omitted,[1] and that *v.* 20 is not the original close of the oracle ascribed to Huldah. Prof. Kittel is also of opinion that xxiii. 4 *b*, 5, 7 *b*, 14, 16-20, 26 *f.*, and perhaps 24 *f.*, are redactional insertions.[2] What remains this scholar regards as on the whole historical. More radical critics, however, reject the whole story of the reformation as an imaginative representation of facts not handed down historically,[3] or as 'a late fiction of men who wished to give credence and authority to this law-book with its purer morals and its more pronounced recognition of Yahweh as the God of Israel.'[4] Lastly, Prof. R. H. Kennett, without rejecting the narrative *in toto*, considers that the story of the desecration of Bethel is a later insertion. He also supposes that the book which so powerfully affected the king was 'some denunciation of sacrifice such as we find in either Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, or Micah,' and that 'this might have been described in the earliest form of the story as a book of *tôrā*, which in later times would be interpreted as a book of *the* tôrā, *i.e.* the Deuteronomic Law.'[5] According to this view, the writing 'found' in the temple was not the Deuteronomic Law, which was of post-exilic origin, but a prophetic utterance on sacrifice.

I must confess that extreme negative theories seem to

[1] Stade and Schwally in *SBOT* are not satisfactory.

[2] Cp. Stade, *GVI* i. 652 *f.*; Benzinger, *Kön.* p. 297.

[3] Erbt, 'Der Fund des Deut.,' *OLZ*, Feb. 15, 1908. 'Es gilt also die Geschichte vom Funde des Dt. als Aussenstehender zu betrachten, für den sie ja auch erzählt ist.'

[4] E. Day, *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* xxi. 198 *ff.* [1902]. On the late date of Dt. see L. Horst, *Rev. de l'hist. des religions*, xvi. 20-65 (continued).

[5] 'The Date of Deut.,' *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, July 1906, p. 492.

me at present unwise. I am not opposed to the admission of imaginative elements, and I own that a strictly logical reconstruction of the later pre-exilic history would be easier without the reformation ascribed to Josiah. But I doubt whether history is always logical, and whether these negative conclusions both as regards the tradition and as regards Deuteronomy can be justifiable till we have made more sure that we have rightly understood the documents. It seems to me that the critics may have relied too much on imperfectly scrutinised texts. If so, what we have to aim at first is a keener textual criticism, and such an interpretation of the contents as the revised text may seem to require.

Let me as briefly as possible recall the religious situation in the eighteenth year of Josiah. The controller of the Divine Company was no longer Yahweh but Baal, and the impure worship of the goddess Asherah had become generally prevalent. In short, the heathenish reaction which had set in under Manasseh was still in full force. This appears, not only from the earlier prophecies of Jeremiah, but from the drastic measures which, as we shall see, the royal reformer considered necessary, when, after long waiting, he set himself to purify the land.

Such was the state of things when Hilkiah, as we read, found a book in the temple (2 K. xxii. 8). The story of its 'finding' is in fact the second part of the preface to the story of the reformation, the first being the incomplete story of the reparation of the temple. We are told that, exactly as in the restoration under Jehoash, the king's scribe was sent to the temple to count the money that had been collected, and to give directions as to its disposal. It was just then (so the text may once have stated) that Hilkiah the priest found a book which he unhesitatingly recognised as the book of *tōrah*. Hilkiah told this to Shaphan the scribe, and then handed the book to him to read. The questions now arise, What did Hilkiah mean by 'the book of *tōrah*,' and what by his statement that he had 'found' it?

The first question can be answered at once. By 'the book of *tōrah*,' Hilkiah must have meant some written record which surpassed every other in the distinctness with which it defined the 'ways' pleasing to Yahweh, and the

tōrah, or body of directions, contained in it, must have taken the form of commands. Such a law-book might naturally claim to be Mosaic. Indeed, earlier law-books, such as the Book of Covenant, had doubtless already made the same claim, for the priests of the greater sanctuaries, when they gave *tōrōth* or 'directions,' must have done so under the authority of Moses. It stands to reason that the writer of the greatest of the law-books did not neglect older works of the same kind, which served as links between himself and the great reputed law-giver Moses. It was on the basis of such earlier books that the kernel of our Deuteronomy may be considered to rest, and no purely conjectural writing (such as that suggested by Prof. Kennett) can have such a claim to be Hilkiah's 'book of *torah*' as is possessed by the kernel of Deuteronomy, when duly provided with prologue and epilogue.

The second question is more difficult. In what sense did Hilkiah 'find' the book? Had the book once been known to the priestly keepers of the archives, and been lost sight of during the religious troubles of Manasseh's reign, till by a pure accident Hilkiah's eyes rested on the precious roll? Or does the phrase imply a theory, which, though incorrect, was thought necessary for the success of the law-book, viz. that a statement of fundamental laws given of old had been lost for centuries, and just now been recovered? Both these theories imply that 'found' is to be taken literally. The interpretation has the merit of simplicity, but when an Oriental text is in question simplicity is not necessarily a recommendation. Oriental phraseology must be interpreted in accordance with Oriental ideas and customs. Now it is an idea of Oriental priesthoods that religious authority needs to be kept up by illusion. We may assume, therefore, that Hilkiah was not groping in the dark, but saw what, from a priestly point of view, had to take place for the good of religion. Acting according to an ancient priestly custom, which involved illusion, he took the recently composed law-book to the temple that he might 'find' it there.

One may venture to speak of 'custom,' in spite of the fact that there is no distinct reference to such a custom in

the Old Testament. For what is the Old Testament but a selection of those relics of the old Hebrew literature which approved themselves to exilic and post-exilic editors? A lacuna such as that referred to is unimportant, and is compensated for by parallels to the single piece of evidence, derived from external sources.

Certainly, of such parallels there is no deficiency. How the priesthoods of Assyria and Babylonia acted, is no secret. The royal inscriptions are our sufficient authority. For where religion is concerned, the real speakers in these are the priests. Take, for instance, the oracle said to have been given by the goddess Nannai,—'Ashurbanipal shall deliver me from wicked Elam';[1] 1635 (1535) years passed, and the fulfilment came. Needless to say who wrote the oracle, and who fulfilled it.

If more decisive parallels are asked for, they can be supplied. That the kings of the New Babylonian Empire were great builders of temples, is well known. Perhaps the greatest of them all was Nabû-na'id (Nabonedus), who, if the inscriptions may be trusted, undertook no important temple-restoration without seeking the foundation stone of the original builder.[2] In almost every case—so he declares—he found it. How great is his self-admiration when he tells (or is made to tell) how he met with the foundation-stones of Ibarra, the temple of Shamash in Sippar, 'which for 3200 years no king had found who lived before me,'[3] or of Iulbar, the temple of Ishtar in Agani, which Nebuchadrezzar, that great builder, had vainly sought![4] Such are the inscriptional statements; can we regard them as historically true? Is it at all probable that Nabû-na'id was really so keen an archæologist? May we not assume that the modern Babylonian priests not only inspired the inscriptions, but produced the old foundation-stones in accordance with their inherited belief in the necessity of illusion for the

[1] *Keilinschr. Bibliothek* (*KB*), ii. 211.

[2] Rogers, *Hist. of Babylonia and Assyria*, ii. 359-363. The parallel was noticed by Erbt, *Sicherstellung des Monotheismus* (1903), pp. 3 *ff.*; *Die Hebräer* (1906), p. 165.

[3] *KB* iii. 2, p. 105.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 85.

religious authority? If they did so, let us not be rash enough to condemn them.

Next let us turn to Egypt. In remote ages the imperial people of the Nile valley must surely have exercised some religious influence on Palestine, which was counteracted indeed by much stronger influences, but may be supposed, in some points of detail, to have continued.

Now there was a practice of Egyptian scribes, first pointed out by Maspero, and among Biblical scholars in 1888 by the present writer,[1] which bears closely on our subject. It was the custom of these officials to insert in transcripts of important works, whether purely religious or quasi-scientific, and whether ancient or not, a statement that the writing in question had been 'found' in the temple of some deity. For instance, a chapter in the medical papyrus now in the British Museum has this rubric, 'This cure was discovered at night by the hand of a minister of the temple of the goddess who happened to go into the hall in the

[1] My attention was turned to this matter by a suggestion of M. Maspero's in the *Revue critique* (1878 or somewhat later) and again in his *Histoire ancienne de l'Orient* (1875), pp. 73 *f.*, 451. In *Jeremiah, his Life and Times* (1888), p. 85, I collected the available Egyptian facts, and mentioned the possibility that Hilkiah's 'finding' might be like the 'finding' of the Egyptian officials. I hesitated, however, to adopt this view for want of an O.T. parallel or analogy. I have long felt that the objection is not a serious one. In 1906—eighteen years afterwards—Prof. Budde referred to Maspero's illustration in his *Geschichte der althebr. Literatur* (1906), p. 109 n. 1. In 1907 M. Ed. Naville published his article 'Egyptian Writings in Foundation-walls, and the Age of the Book of Deuteronomy,' *PSBA*, xxix. 232-242 (1907), which was noticed by Erbt in *OLZ*, Feb. 15, 1908, and has stirred up a little controversy in that learned periodical. The authorities cited by me in 1888, besides Maspero, are Brugsch, *Gesch. Aeg.* pp. 60, 84; Birch, *Aeg. Zt.*, 1871, p. 63. To these should now be added Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. Aeg.* pp. 79, 303 (referred to by Marti); Lepage Renouf, *TSBA* ix. 2, pp. 295 *f.*, *PSBA* xv. 6 (1893), and Naville (as above). [Prof. Marti informs me that he too in 1892 took up the subject, mentioning my own book, in an article in the *Zt. für Theol. u. Kirche*, p. 44. M. Naville, in a letter to the author, draws a distinction between M. Maspero's theory and his own, in that the former considers the documents said to have been 'found' to have been forgeries, while he himself regards the rubrics as veracious. I do not, however, see the necessity for such a distinction, and incidentally I think the word 'forgeries,' with its Western associations, should be avoided.]

temple of the city of Tebmut in the secret places of that goddess. The land at the time was in darkness, but the moon shone on that book all over it. It was brought as a valuable treasure to His Majesty King Kheops.' Similarly it was claimed for a copy of one of the medical treatises in the Berlin papyrus, edited by Brugsch, that it 'was found in ancient writing, in a coffer of books at the feet of the god Anup of Sekhem, in the days of the holiness of the king of the two Egypts, the Veracious.' Again, in the 'Book of the Dead' (Naville) there is an important chapter entitled the 'chapter of the heart,' and supposed to be spoken by a deceased person to his heart when it was weighed on the scale in the judgment. The rubric attached to it runs thus, 'This chapter was found at Shmun (Hermopolis) on a slab of stone of the south, written in true lapis under the feet of the god.' There is also another chapter (lxiv.) of the same 'Book of the Dead' (Naville), which, in one of its versions, has the following rubric, 'This chapter was found in the foundations of Amihunnu by the overseer of the men who built a wall, in the time of king Usaphais; its figures are mysterious, nobody has seen them nor looked at them.' The meaning appears to be that the writing, which was ancient and difficult, had been placed in a foundation-wall, and that it was found afterwards by the overseer of a party of masons engaged in repairing the temple. And just so, in a very late text (time of Ptolemy XIII.) on a wall of one of the crypts of the temple of Denderah, it was stated that Thothmes III. 'found the great rule of Denderah . . . inside a wall of bricks of the southern house in the time of the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, the lord of the two lands, Meri Ra, the son of Ra, the lord of diadems, Pepi.'[1]

Now, it is of course conceivable that copies of ancient and important Egyptian writings may sometimes have been placed, as soon as written, in temples, either near 'the feet of the gods' (*i.e.* near their statues) or in foundation walls. But that all the written documents for which this claim is put forward were really ancient and from the first so placed,

[1] One may add that Philo of Byblus (second century A.D.) asserts that the Phœnician history of Sanchoniathon had been brought out of concealment by himself.

is most improbable. There must generally have been much illusion in the matter. It must be repeated that our own standards of morality cannot be applied to ancient Oriental priests or scribes. One must, I think, agree with Maspero and Hugo Winckler that this would be undue modernising, and would not correspond to our experience of the habits of the ancient priesthoods.

Two incomplete analogies for the course here ascribed to Hilkiah may be adduced from the Old Testament itself. (1) In Neh. xiii. 1 *ff.* it appears as if the passage, Dt. xxiii. 4-6, was for the first time 'found written' in the 'book of Moses' in the age of Nehemiah. Yet it was only 'found' there because it had lately been inserted. And (2) in Dt. xxxi. 26 Moses is said to have commanded the Levites thus, 'Take this book of *tōrah*, and put it beside the ark of the *bĕrīth* of Yahweh your God.' The late writer of this passage must have known the narrative of the finding of the law-book, and may have sought to justify the 'finding' by a tale of the original depositing of the previous roll, not indeed in the temple, but in the most honourable position possible, beside the ark of Yahweh.

CHAPTER III

HULDAH THE PROPHETESS AND THE REFORMATION

LET us now return to the story in 2 K. xxii. No importance attaches to the fact that Shaphan and not Hilkiah is expressly stated to have read the book that was found. Even if the reformers had taken the trouble to put the law-book into ancient Hebrew script, yet we might fairly assume that priests of high rank would be able to read it, otherwise how could they hand on the old religious traditions, or adapt old laws to the use of a later age? M. Naville, therefore, has no solid ground for maintaining that Shaphan the scribe read the book to Josiah because he had enjoyed a better literary training than Hilkiah. He read it because it was his function to do so, just as a secretary in our day would naturally read a newly found document to his superior. Whether any one else heard it besides the king, we are not told. But we are informed that as soon as the reading was over (it cannot have taken long), the horrified king sent a deputation, including both Hilkiah and Shaphan, to obtain an oracle from Yahweh. It is evident that some part of the book was of a highly threatening import. Most probably there were solemn curses imprecated upon the people, in the event of its disobedience to certain fundamental laws, and forming a suitable close to the entire law-book.

Can this part of the traditional story be altogether historical? Surely Josiah and his priest must have been at one as to the best means of reforming religion. Surely, too, Josiah must have foreknown and approved the choice of a prophetic adviser made by the deputation (cp. 2 K. xix. 2). The choice fell, not, of course, on Jeremiah, who was out of

sympathy with book-religion, but on the prophetess Huldah. She is described (xxii. 14) as being 'the wife of Shallum, son of Tikvah (or as otherwise called), son of Ḥarḥas, keeper of the garments.' So at least the traditional text says, but some of the words appear to be wrong, and the whole description may have been misunderstood. The name Huldah, for instance, is neither an epithet of a deity[1] nor a monument of early Semitic totemism,[2] but, like Ḥadlai in 2 Chr. xxviii. 12, is of Ishmaelite or N. Arabian origin;[3] so too, obviously, is Shallum[4] (cp. 1 Chr. ii. 40). Tikvah ('confidence'!) is not less transparent; it is a corruption of Tekoʿa. More than one Tekoʿa probably existed;[5] the one meant here was in the district called Ḥarḥas (in 2 Chr. Ḥasrah), *i.e.* Yarḥam-Ashḥur.[6] Next comes the strange title *shōmēr bĕgādīm*, which is usually explained as 'keeper of the royal wardrobe.' The theory has very slight probability. Nowhere else does such an official title occur, and there is nothing in the context to suggest that the royal attire is referred to. It is reasonable to suspect corruption of the text.

Let us act on this suspicion, and begin with בגדים. Sound method requires us to group this word with similar corrupt combinations of letters, the key to which has been found. Such combinations are גמדים in Ezek. xxvii. 11,[7] and פגרים in 2 K. xix. 35.[8] The former occurs among a number of ethnics or place-names in a poetic description of the commerce of Ṣor, *i.e.* Miṣṣōr (the N. Arabian Muṣri); גמדים is of course miswritten for גמרים, which should be the plural of גמרי, from the well-known but much misunderstood גמר[9] (Gen. x. 2, Ezek. xxxviii. 6), which, like רגם in רגם מלך

[1] 'The Ever-young Virgin' (Winckler, *Krit. Schriften*, ii. 45 *f.*).

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Shaphan.'

[3] If the *d* in both these names, as well as in the Nabatæan Ḥaldu (G. A. Cooke, *N.-Sem. Inscr.* p. 256) is an error for *r*, we may group them with Raḥel, which is probably a popular corruption of רחמאל = ירחמאל (*T. and B.* p. 373). Cp. אחרחל, 1 Chr. iv. 8, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el.

[4] *E. Bib.*, 'Shallum.'

[5] *Ibid.*, 'Tekoa.'

[6] *T. and B.* pp. 23, 205, etc.

[7] *Crit. Bib.*, on Ezek. *l.c.*

[8] *Ibid.*, on 2 K. *l.c.*; *T. and B.* p. 147.

[9] *T. and B.* p. 157.

(Zech. vii. 2), comes from ירחם (Yarḥam-Yeraḥme'el). פגרים occurs in the narrative of the destruction of an Ashḥurite king's army, where again the original is גמרים. There remains שמר, which is probably the short for שמרון, an expansion of the clan-name שמר, such as may have existed in more than one district. It is not, therefore, a court title that we have before us, but a geographical gloss stating that חרחס is = שמרון גמרים, 'Shimron of the Gamrites (Gomeriṭes).' And our total result is that Shallum at any rate was a native of N. Arabia, and that Huldah as well as Shallum has a name of N. Arabian affinities.

These facts are not unimportant, for the original centre of prophecy was not in Palestine but in N. Arabia. Some at least of the O.T. prophets can be shown to have originated in N. Arabia, *i.e.* in that part of the N. Arabian border-land which appears to have been occupied, at any rate at intervals, by Israel. It was indeed the Holy Land of the Israelites;[1] there was the scene of their most sacred stories, and though there were great religious risks, yet those very risks called forth the heroic courage of the few, chief among whom were Elijah and Elisha. Could we then be surprised if a prophetess like Huldah, with her N. Arabian though Israelite husband, resided among the Israelites in that region? And it so happens that in 2 K. xxii. 14 there is a parenthetic note which refers to Huldah's place of residence, and probably supports my suggestion. Usually it is supposed to state that 'she dwelt in Jerusalem, in the second quarter.'[2] But how can this be correct? Surely it is most unimportant whether the prophetess lived in the first quarter or in the second. The lexicons, it is true, confirm the explanation of *mishneh* as 'second quarter' by Zeph. i. 10, but that passage too has been misunderstood. For the most probable view of *mishneh* in Zeph. i. 10 is that it is a popular corruption of Ishmanah or Shemanah[3] (fem. of Ishman or Shemen, *i.e.*

[1] See Introduction (on the Negeb).

[2] For another view see *E. Bib.*, 'College,' 'Hassenaah,' 'Huldah. The explanation of *mishneh* given above will also suit for Gen. xli. 43, 2 Chr. xxxv. 24 (see *T. and B.* p. 462, with note 3).

[3] Following Marti as to the extent of the strophe, but using our own lights as to *mishneh* and *maktesh*, we obtain this sense—

Ishmael), and that this was the designation of a quarter of Jerusalem specially appropriated to N. Arabians, including the numerous class of magicians. A gloss in *v.* 11 explains that 'all the people of Canaan are destroyed, all that practise secret enchantments[1] are cut off.' What Canaan is we may learn from Zeph. ii. 5; it is the land of the Philistines, and the Philistines are not Semitised Cretans, but a tribe of Ishmaelites, as their name, duly criticised, shows.[2]

But to return to 2 K. xxii. 14. The note may conceivably state that Huldah resided 'in Jerusalem, in the N. Arabian quarter.' I think, however, that the other view is much more attractive, viz. that the prophetess resided in Israelitish N. Arabia. In this case we must suppose that Ishmanah or Shemanah in the note is a place-name, and that Yerushalaim has sprung (as in some other passages) from an ill-written Ishmael, and the note will state that Huldah dwelt in the country of Ishmael (*i.e.* N. Arabia), in a place called Ishmanah. I call this view the more attractive one, because, since the greatest moral dangers arose from the borderland, it would be natural to seek counsel of one who resided in the neighbourhood of those dangers. May I not go even further, and suggest that Huldah may not merely have been consulted on the occasion related in 2 Kings, but have already been specially concerned in the expansion of Yahwistic laws. It is not unreasonable to assume that an earnest effort had been made to keep Israelitish residents in N. Arabia in the right path. The effort would naturally take the form of the preparation of a law-book claiming divine authority. It had very possibly done so before this time, and a careful scrutiny of Deuter-

> Hark! a cry from the fish-gate,
> A howling from Ishmanah;
> Great wailing from the hills,
> The dwellers in Methukash howl.

Ishmanah and Methukash are parallel, and have the same meaning. מחוכש (= אחמעל אשחר), underlying מכחש here, and משחית in 2 K. xxiii. 13, means the N. Arabian quarter.

[1] Read מליטי נשף (cp. למים, להטים).

[2] 'Pelethites' and 'Philistines' have been confounded, *i.e.* פלשתים should be פלחים; cp. פלם and פלח, also חפל (Dt. i. 1). All these latter forms originate in Ethbaal = Ishmael. On the Philistine question see Introduction.

onomy may show us that it did so in the time of Josiah. Among the chief helpers of such an attempt we may perhaps venture to reckon the prophetess Huldah.

We can now understand better on what grounds Hilkiah and the others probably selected their counsellor. It was not the first time that they and she had met—either in Jerusalem or in the N. Arabian border-land. The law-book 'found,' or brought forward, by Hilkiah was really a revised and adapted form of a law-book intended for Israel in Arabia. And it is reasonable to surmise that Josiah knew this, and that the account of the visit of the deputation to Huldah is far from corresponding to facts. Indeed, would it not be passing strange if all that the deputation had to do was to report the nervous prostration of Josiah, and his inability to determine upon a course of action? And then, as to Huldah's answer (xxii. 15-20), to what state of mind can it be said to be related? Is it to that described in *vv.* 11-13? Surely not. How would it comfort Josiah, or restore his moral energy, to be told that Jerusalem and all its inhabitants except himself should be destroyed? Or is it to that which is here supposed to be his true mental state—viz. abounding joy at the happy completion of the law-book? Still more certainly not.

The most probable view seems to be that Huldah—if she gave any oracle at all—had an eye at once to religion and to politics. She knew that there was constant danger from one or another troublesome potentate. Assyria, indeed, was sinking into decay, but more than one N. Arabian power was capable of disturbing the peace of Judah. The oracle which one naturally expects would have contained something like this: 'Danger still threatens, not from Assyria, but from the land of Ṣaphon.[1] Therefore, O king of Judah, reconcile thyself and thy people with thy God. The book of the *tōrah* of Yahweh is before thee. By obedience to its precepts shalt thou be exalted above thy foes. Otherwise great evil shall fall upon thee and upon thy people, and ye shall die in a land which ye have not known.'

[1] The region whence the invaders come is commonly so styled by Jeremiah. See below.

Let us now return to the tradition. There is no trace of moral discouragement in the resolute and imperious monarch who, at the head of his people, accepts Hilkiah's law-book (2 K. xxiii. 1-3). He knows his strength and he uses it. The phraseology of the narrative may have been manipulated, but if there was an assembly at all, the circumstances must have been somewhat as they are here described. Prophets must have been there as well as priests and elders of the people, and the position taken up by the king in order to read the law-book (in this copy, then, the letters were not archaic) is entirely in order, as we shall see by comparing *v.* 3 with the statement in 2 K. xi. 14, 'and when she looked, behold, the king (Jehoash) stood by the pillar, as the usage was.' The pillar, in both cases, was no doubt that called in the Hebrew of 1 K. vii. 21 Yākīn. This appears to be a corruption of some form of Yeraḥme'el (such as Yakman), the name of one of the holy Two, or Three, who formed, in N. Arabia, the divine Company. It will be remembered that Yakin and Bo'az[1] (in 𝔊^{B} Yakum and Balaz—the latter points to some corrupt form of Ishmael) were the two bronze pillars erected in the porch of Solomon's temple. The original names were not such as Josiah would have sanctioned. But he did not scruple to station himself by one of them after the objectionable names had (probably long ago) been modified. There it was that he read the law-book aloud, and there that he made a covenant or compact before Yahweh (as Jehoiada in the name of Jehoash had done before) to walk before Yahweh, and so to verify the words (promises) of this compact that were written in this book (xxiii. 3).

The ease with which the revolution was effected may well startle us. How many there must have been in that assembly who had luxuriated in the enjoyment of the popular cults! Yet now such persons gave up their most cherished practices, and accepted the yoke of a book-religion. It is passing strange. Had Josiah the assistance of a second wonder-working Elijah? No; but he had on

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Jachin and Boaz'; *Crit. Bib.* p. 324; *T. and B.* pp. 30 (n. 2), 369; Nikolsky (Hilgenfeld's *Zt.*, 1904, pp. 1-20); W. E. Barnes, *J. of Theol. Stud.*, April 1904, pp. 447 *ff.*

his side not only the two chief priests[1] and the three keepers of the sacred threshold,[2] but most probably, like Jehoash, at no great distance off, the royal guards.

The work assigned to the great temple ministers at once suggests the real nature of the reformation. It was an attack on that harmful type of religion, established by Manasseh, which most[3] regard as Assyrio-Babylonian, but which, more probably, was N. Arabian. At the king's command (*v.* 4), Hilkiah and his fellows brought out all the vessels of Baal and Asherah,[4] and of all the host of heaven (see p. 25). These were burned outside Jerusalem in the smelting-furnaces (?)[5] of the Kidron; their 'dust,' we are told, was taken to Bethel, *i.e.* probably to the *bāmah* made by Jeroboam, and destroyed (as we shall see) by Josiah. From the same source (probably) we learn that the venerated symbol of Asherah in the temple (*v.* 6; cp. xxi. 7) was carried to the Kidron, where it was burned and actually stamped to powder (cp. *vv.* 12, 15), as if to minimise the risk of malign supernatural influence. Nor was even this enough to satisfy the foes of heathenism. To desecrate this image still further, the powder was despitefully cast upon the common burying-place (xxiii. 6).

Already, perhaps, we can see the real nature of the movement. It appears that Baal (or Yeraḥme'el) and Asherah, or sometimes Ashtart, were combined in a N. Arabian divine duad, and if it be urged that Yahweh may also have been worshipped by the N. Arabians, yet the directing member of the triad thus produced was, not Yahweh, but Baal. (To these deities we shall return.) As

[1] That is, the priest of Jerusalem and the priest (not priests, see xxv. 18) of the second rank (in xxv. 18 parallel to 'the chief priest'), or perhaps the priest of Shemanah, *i.e.* Ishmael (see p. 19). The title may have been borne by the priest of the sanctuary of the Israelites in N. Arabia (see on Dt. xii. 5). The writer of xxv. 18 may not have known the true origin of *mishneh* (= Shemanah). Huldah, as we have seen, was probably a prophetess of Shemanah.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Threshold.'

[3] *E.g.* M'Curdy, *Hist., Proph., and Mon.* ii. 385.

[4] In *v.* 5 Mazzaloth (Yishme'elith) stands for Asherah (*T. and B.* p. 19, n. 2; *Crit. Bib.* p. 390). In 1 K. xv. 13 we meet with the name *miphleṣeth*, which may have the same origin as *mazzaloth*

[5] משרפות (Klostermann).

the foe of Ashtart, Josiah was, of course, violently opposed to all that belonged to the cult of that goddess, and especially to the sacred prostitution suggested by the names *ḳedēshīm* (xxiii. 7 *a*)[1] and *ḳedēshōth*. The men and women so called were numerous both in N. Arabia[2] and in the land of Judah.[3] The urgent need for a distinct prohibition of that unhappy devotion was met by the command in Dt. xxiii. 18. Not less numerous were the priests called *kemārīm*. This we learn, not only from the narrative before us, but from a much-vexed passage in Isaiah (ii. 5), where the reason why Yahweh has forsaken his people is stated to be their addiction to foreign magic and soothsaying; evidently *miḳḳedem* should be *kemārīm*. The name is suggestive; it shows that the priests so styled had N. Arabian affinities.[4] On the whole passage, see chap. v.

The fact is that religion was a specialty of the N. Arabians, and priests as well as prophets travelled about Judah in search of occupation (xxiii. 5). Wherever there was a *bāmah* their services were in request; the kings of Judah had themselves 'ordained' or sanctioned this custom. Now, however, the priests had to retire in obedience to a fresh command. They were the guardians of all those practices which Josiah most abhorred. It was essential to save the people from their pernicious influence. They were therefore deposed. According to another account (*v.* 9), the priests (*kōhănê*) of the *bāmōth* were allowed to eat unleavened bread among their brethren, though they might

[1] The gloss in *v.* 7 *b* is obscure.

[2] *T. and B.* p. 448. Simulation of this cult was one feature of this cult in N. Arabia (see on Dt. xxii. 5, 9-11).

[3] See 1 K. xiv. 24, xv. 12.

[4] The name almost certainly comes from רקמים. רקם is a frequent corruption of ירחם = ירחמאל (see *T. and B.*, pp. 62, 376; cp. 372). The *kemārīm* are also mentioned in Hos. x. 5, Zeph. i. 4, and probably Job iii. 5, where the text is plainly wrong, and should be read יבעתהו כמרי יום, 'let the priests of Yaman affright it.' The origin of the word goes back into remote antiquity, at least if *kāmiru* in the Amarna Tablets has the meaning 'priest.' It also occurs in an Aramaic form in the first of the Elephantine papyri edited by Sachau (1907), where, as in the Hebrew Scriptures, it is doubtless used without knowledge of its origin. In fact, the writer who speaks for the Egyptian-Jewish community uses כמריא of the priests of the Egyptian god Khnum.

not take part in the altar-service at Jerusalem. Apparently these priests either were or became Yahwists. It is of the distress of such persons that a pathetic account, in the style of prophecy, seems to be given in 1 S. ii. 36. They are represented as the descendants of Eli (*i.e.* Abiathar), displaced by the 'faithful priest' (Zadok), to whom they come crouching for some humble priestly office, as a means of livelihood. The one objection to this is that there are two glosses[1] in *v.* 36, which (critically restored) run thus, 'with regard to the temple of Kashram, Ashkar-Yeraḥme'el,' and 'with regard to Ashkal, Beth-Yeraḥme'el,' implying that the priests are Yeraḥme'elites, and that they are in search of posts in their own chief sanctuary (see p. 27), called sometimes Ashkar-Yeraḥme'el, sometimes Beth-Yeraḥme'el. It is possible that in xxiii. 9 ירושלם has been substituted by the redactor for ישמעאל (Ishmael = Yeraḥme'el). At any rate, these priests seem to be worshippers of Yahweh. They may perhaps have traced their origin to Eli. The Shiloh referred to in 1 S. i.-iv. was probably in the N. Arabian border-land. A third statement about the priests (xxiii. 20) is probably a late fiction.

Among the worst abominations were sacrifices of children. They were offered to Melek,[2] who was the great N. Arabian god, regarded no longer as the giver of vegetation, but as the stern ruler of the underworld, and who was also called Ethbal, *i.e.* Ishmael (= Yeraḥme'el). This we learn from 2 K. xxiii. 10, where the impossible לבלתי[3] is simply miswritten for לְאַחְבַּל (cp. בלתי from אתבל in Isa. x. 4), which is a gloss on לְמֹלֶךְ. Child-sacrifices in Canaan

[1] The words לאגורת כסף ככר לחם and לאכל פת־לחם are glosses. The text needs correction. In the former gloss, כסף, as in Isa. xlviii. 10, comes most probably from חשרם = כסרם (see note on כשרים). אגורת is the Aram. אגורא, which, in the Targums has the late meaning 'heathen altar,' but in the Aramaic papyri (see especially those of Elephantine) is used of the temple of Yahu (= Yahweh). Thus, an O.T. passage for the first time receives a natural and a practically certain explanation, thanks to an unexpected find of papyri. In the latter, אכל, as often, represents אשכל (= Asshur-Yeraḥme'el); לאכל, presupposed by 𝔊 in *v.* 28 (εἰς βρῶσιν), has the same meaning as here, viz. 'with reference to Ashkal.' פת represents בית; לחם is a popular corruption of רחמל (ירחמאל).

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Molech' (Moore); *T. and B.*, pp. 50-54.

[3] Not recognised by 𝔊, Pesh.

are proved by the explorations;[1] in N. Arabia, by the original underlying text of Gen. xxii. They are denounced and forbidden in Dt. xii. 31, xviii. 10, though the strongest prohibition is in Lev. xviii. 21. Jeremiah[2] (xix. 4 *f.*, xxxii. 35) and Ezekiel (xx. 26) are equally vehement, and it was only to be expected that what Manasseh had sanctioned by his own practice Josiah should do his utmost to extinguish.

Sun-worship was also prevalent in Judah (*vv.* 5, 11 *f.*). Ezekiel (viii. 16) tells of men who worshipped the sun towards the east, with their backs towards Yahweh's temple. Predecessors of Josiah had dedicated horses (of bronze?) to the sun. These Josiah destroyed; the chariot (so Stade, after ⑥) of the sun-god he burned. Whence came this sun-worship? Perhaps from Assyria. But it is very possible that Baal or Yeraḥme'el in one of his aspects was the sun-god,[3] and that this is the source of Manasseh's sun-worship. In *v.* 5 'the sun and the moon' may be an interpolated gloss on 'Baal and Mazzaloth' (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el and the Ishmaelite goddess), and it is certain that in *v.* 4 (cp. 2 K. xxi. 3) the cult of Baal is closely joined to that of 'all the host of heaven.' The fusion of the cult of Baal or Yeraḥme'el with that of the sun in Judah may perhaps be placed in the reign of Manasseh (2 K. xxi. 5).

Even the *bāmōth* of Solomon were not spared. Sidonian, Moabite, and Ammonite cults should no longer defile the neighbourhood of the temple. The description of the site of these places is remarkable. It was east of Jerusalem, and south of the *har hammashḥīth*, 'the mount of the destroyer.' Most probably, however, *mashḥīth* (like *maktesh* in Zeph. i. 11; see p. 18, note 3) comes from some form like *methūshaḥ*, *i.e.* 'Ishmael-Ashḥur.[4] The name of the hill alludes to the fact that the original inhabitants of the district were Jebusites, *i.e.* a tribe of Ishmaelites.

And now a grave difficulty arises. We are told in

[1] Père Vincent, *Canaan* (1907), pp. 188, 195.

[2] Jeremiah, in xix. 4 *f.*, speaks of Baal, but clearly Baal and Melek are parallel (Jer. xxxii. 35).

[3] See *T. and B.* p. 273 (on the connexion between Ishmael and the sun, and the origin of the name Bethshemesh).

[4] See *T. and B.* p. 107.

2 K. xxiii. 4 that the 'dust' of the vessels that were burned outside Jerusalem was carried to Bethel, and in *v.* 15 that Josiah broke down the altar and high place of Bethel. To reject the Bethel-episode would be arbitrary. Shall we, then, suppose that, in the enfeebled condition of Assyria, Josiah felt the stirrings of ambition, and aspired to re-unite north and south under one sceptre?[1] The theory is in itself plausible, and harmonises with the statement that Josiah went to meet an Egyptian army at Megiddo in N. Israel. Still, apart from the uncertainty of the reading 'Megiddo,' the close political and religious relations between Israel and N. Arabia, which I have tried to point out elsewhere, may lead one to think that another theory has a still greater probability. The theory is, that Bethel (which, like בלתי, 2 K. xxiii. 10, probably comes from Ethbal, *i.e.* Ishmael) may, in *vv.* 4, 15, be the name of a place in the N. Arabian borderland, to which region therefore Josiah must have extended his iconoclastic operations. And why should Josiah not have done so? Obviously the reformation was needed in N. Arabia as much as in Judah, and Josiah was not the man to leave his work half done. If he occupied the Israelite territory in N. Arabia, he would feel bound to make it genuinely a Holy Land. As to the evidence, the whole story of the reformation is presumptive evidence.

It is an important fact, which I must not omit to point out, that by this theory, and this alone, is it possible to give a perfectly natural correction of the text of xxiii. 8 *b*. This is how the passage runs in the A.V., 'and brake down the high places of the gates that were in the entering in of the gate of Joshua the governor of the city, which were on a man's left hand at the gate of the city.' 'The high places of the gates'; how impossible! If, however, we correct השערים, not into השעירים, 'the satyr-like demons,' but into

[1] The Chronicler (2 Chr. xxxiv. 6 *f.*, 33) may have had a similar notion respecting Josiah, but there is reason to think that the statements of the earlier writer on which he built may have had a different reference. This means correcting the two corrupt words at the end of *v.* 6 into ברחבות ירחם, 'in Yarḥamite Reḥoboth,' indicating that the iconoclasm took place in some part of the N. Arabian border-land. This affects the correctness of 2 Chr. xv. 19, xxx. 1, 10 *f.*, 18, xxxi. 1.

הָאֲשֵׁרִים,[1] 'the Asshurs,' *i.e.*, the symbols of the N. Arabian god Asshur,'[2] we shall have taken the first step towards a consistent sense. And how improbable are both the definitions of the situation of the *bāmōth*! Neither Kittel nor Stade suggests any probable or even plausible emendations. Perhaps it is some defect in their point of view which hinders them. At any rate, we surely want, not a personal name like Yehoshua, but a place-name. יְהוֹשֻׁעַ שַׁר־הָעִיר should probably be יְהוֹאַשַּׁר הָעִיר, 'the city Yeḥoasshur,'[3] or perhaps יְרַחַם־אַשַּׁר העיר, 'the city Yarḥam-Asshur.' It is probable that the equivalent forms Asshur-Yarḥam and Ashkar-Yeraḥme'el underlie cryptic phrases in Dt. xii. 5 and 1 S. ii. 36 respectively, and that it is the name of the place where was the central sanctuary which claimed the exclusive veneration of N. Arabian Israelites. Almost the same name (אַשַּׁר־ישמעאל) underlies part of the equally corrupt second descriptive clause (אשר־על־שמאול איש);[4] what remains (בשער העיר) represents beyond doubt באשר העיר, 'in the city Asshur.' Thus, omitting incorrect variants, we obtain this simple and natural sense of the original, underlying text, 'and broke down the *bāmōth* of the Asshur-idols which were in the entrance of the city Yarḥam-Asshur.'

We cannot, however, pass over the first part of xxiii. 8, which states that the *bāmōth* on which the priests had offered illegitimate sacrifices were spread 'from Geba to Beer-sheba.' These places, it may be objected, were not in the N. Arabian border-land, but formed the northern and southern boundaries respectively of the land of Judah. If, then, we have found the right explanation of *v.* 8 *b*, it would seem that this passage cannot be the right sequel of *v.* 8 *a*. It would indeed seem so. But must we not go further, and say that *v.* 8 *a*, if the ordinary explanation is correct, excludes the view that Josiah carried the reform to any

[1] Ashērīm (from Asher) is a parallel form to Asshurim (from Asshur). See *T. and B.* p. 24. The Asherim were, of course, destroyed by Josiah, xxiii. 14, cp. Dt. vii. 5.

[2] See *T. and B.* p. 24.

[3] The form would be unusual; cp. the personal name יהואש.

[4] The first half of the clause represents 'Asshur-Ishmael,' the second 'Ishmael-Asshur.' איש comes from אש, *i.e.* אַשַּׁר. The two forms, of course, refer to the same city.

district or region outside Judah proper? And yet, as we have seen, to deny that he crossed the border at all, would be arbitrary. The solution of the problem is that either *v.* 8 *a* belongs to a different source from *v.* 8 *b*—a source which did not refer to the extension of the reform beyond the limits of Judah proper, or else the Geba and Beersheba referred to were not in Judah but in the N. Arabian borderland.[1] In the latter case, a shortened form of 'Yeraḥme'el' must have been mistaken for a shortened form of 'Yehudah'; *i.e.* for 'out of the cities of Judah' we should read 'out of the cities of Yeraḥme'el.'[2]

The conclusion here arrived at is not without consequences. If there is a N. Arabian Bethel in 2 K. xxiii., there must also be one, not only in 1 K. xiii., but in 1 K. xii. (the steers of gold), and why not also in Gen. xxviii. and in the Book of Amos? The truth is that the different parts of the Old Testament are so closely connected that we cannot change our opinion on one without having to reconsider our opinion on some of the others. As another instance of this, take the story in Jer. xli. 5 respecting the eighty men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Shōmĕrōn, who came in mourning guise to Mizpah, the seat of government of the hapless Gedaliah.[3] Their object is said to have been to bring offerings to the 'house of Yahweh.' What was this 'house of Yahweh?' Most reply, the great one at Jerusalem. But how came pilgrims from the land of N. Israel to be so deeply interested in the fallen sanctuary of Judah? Must we not exchange our point of view for one in harmony with the preceding results? As I have pointed out already by anticipation, the Israelites in the southern

[1] Geba is only another form of Gibeah. Beer-sheba = well of Shema (Ishmael), not 'well of the Seven-god.' Bethel = Ethbaal = Ishmael (*T. and B.* pp. 311 *f.*, 371).

[2] Cp. 1 S. xxx. 26, where, in the original text, as restored, David sends presents to the elders of Yeraḥme'el. In the M.T. of *v.* 29 we actually find the two glosses, 'in the cities of the Yeraḥme'elites' and 'in the cities of the Kenites.' See *Crit. Bib.* p. 245.

[3] It is here supposed that Gedaliah was governor of the 'cities of Yeraḥme'el' (reading thus in Jer. xl. 5 instead of 'cities of Judah,' as in 2 K. xxiii. 8. Cp. *Crit. Bib.*, p. 73, and on the story in Jer. xli., *The Historians' History the World*, ii. 7.

border-land occupied by Josiah had probably their own sanctuary. It has also been shown that Shechem, Shiloh, and Shōmĕrōn (or Shimron) were most probably N. Arabian as well as N. Israelite place-names, the Yeraḥme'elite clans having carried these names with them in their migrations. The pilgrims, therefore, were very possibly Israelites of N. Arabia, who resorted to their own sanctuary, situated perhaps near Mizpah.[1]

The destruction of the altar and *bāmaḥ* at Bethel[2] (*v.* 15) was only to be expected considering their history. From some other source it is added (*v.* 19) that what Josiah had done at Bethel he repeated at all the houses of the *bāmōth* that were in the cities of Shōmĕrōn,[3] and that he slew all the officiating priests. The latter statement need not delay us; it may be a mere fiction suggested by 1 K. xiii. 2. As to Shōmĕrōn or Shimron, it is plainly in the same region as Bethel, *i.e.* in N. Arabia. As we know already (p. 18) there was a Shōmĕrōn or Shimron of the Gomerites; Huldah's husband was a native of this place or district. It is also noteworthy that in Am. vi. 1 צִיּוֹן and שֹׁמְרוֹן should be parallel, which can only be the case if צִיּוֹן can be corrected into צִבְעוֹן, *i.e.* not 'hyna,' but 'Ishmael.'[4] In other words, in Am. vi. 1 Shōmĕrōn is a N. Arabian name. And still more important is it that in 2 K. xvii. 6 there appears to be a confusion between the Assyrian capture of the city of Shōmĕrōn in the north, and the Asshurite conquest of the region of Shōmĕrōn or Shimron in the south.[5]

The only other important detail of the reformation is that in xxiii. 24, relative to magic and all heathenish objects (teraphim, etc.), and practices surviving in the land of Judah. By abolishing these, Josiah undid the mischief caused by his

[1] There were many hill-towns called Mizpah. Cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K. xv. 22.

[2] For Winckler's ingenious but arbitrary correction see *KAT*(3), p. 277.

[3] Shōmĕrōn here, as in 1 K. xvii. 24, etc., is a regional name.

[4] See Introduction (on forms of Ishmael).

[5] See Special Note. The names of places and deities in 1 K. xvii. 24 *ff.* point in different directions. One may, however, venture to lay the most stress on those which point to N. Arabia, for what redactor would have inserted these among Assyrian-sounding names?

reactionary grandfather (xxi. 6). Manasseh was a pro-Asshurite king, and among the most popular Asshurite or N. Arabian religious forms were those which opened the door of the unseen world. How earnestly the Deuteronomist dehorts from such practices, is well-known (see Dt. xviii. 10*b*-12). One may greatly doubt, however, whether Josiah did permanently abolish them (see Zech. x. 2).

The reformation being finished, the workers 'returned to Jerusalem.' Was there any concluding celebration? From 2 K. xxiii. 21-23 we might suppose that there was—viz. the passover. The account may, however, be a mere appendix, as the highly artificial narrative in 2 Chr. xxxv. undoubtedly is. On the other hand, in the Hezekiah-narrative the passover precedes the reformation (2 Chr. xxx.-xxxi. 1). The probability is that there were two forms of tradition,[1] according to one of which the covenant, and according to the other the passover, was the sign that Israel had again become Yahweh's people. It was not easy to work these two forms of tradition together, and the compilers took different lines. It will be noticed that both in 2 Kings and in 2 Chr. the reformation-passover is regarded as the first legal one (cp. Dt. xvi. 2, 5-7). Forgetful of his own elaborate account of Hezekiah's national passover, and with only slight variations on 2 K. xxiii. 22 (cp. Neh. viii. 17), the Chronicler fervently declares that such a passover as this had not been held since the days of Samuel, nor had all the kings of Israel kept such a passover. How far even the brief notice in 2 Kings is based on fact, it is impossible to say. Most probably the reformation-passover has but a symbolic value.

It is much to be regretted that the imaginative element in this lengthy narrative is so considerable. In Wellhausen's abridgment of the Book of Campaigns of the Messenger of God by Wakidy, we find a striking sketch of the Arabian reformer overthrowing the 360 idols around the Ka'ba at Mecca, and looking on while, at his command, the great image of Hubal was broken in pieces. A description as full of colour of Josiah's proceedings would have been very

[1] So first Erbt, *OLZ*, Feb. 1908.

precious. We may note, by the way, that Mohammed does not seem to have shown any hostility to Arabian dolmens, which militates against Colonel Conder's theory[1] that the paucity of such stone monuments in W. Palestine is due to the iconoclasm of Josiah. For my own part, I think that the amount of Josiah's iconoclasm has been exaggerated. To have ordered the universal destruction of *bāmōth* would have been futile; the order would not have been carried out. I base my scepticism on these two grounds. The first is the fact that the old Canaanite and N. Arabian cults at once regained their prominence on the death of Josiah. A similar reaction took place in Egypt on the death of the 'heretic king' Amen-hotep IV., and its violence unmistakably shows that the religious revolution set on foot by that king had not been at all universal or complete.[2] The second, that among the virtual opponents of Josiah were not only the partisans of the displaced religion, but also the adherents of a diametrically opposite school. It was a school with a moral strength out of all proportion to its numbers, and its leading member was that lofty prophet and soldier of God, whose greatness cannot have been wholly unseen during his lifetime, but was first fully recognised after his passing—Jeremiah.

That Jeremiah, a pioneering thinker, was opposed to book-religion will be one of the acquisitions of our next chapter. In justice, however, to the school of Hilkiah and Josiah, let it be acknowledged that Jeremiah, saintly as he was, lacked that faculty of persuasion which the Second Isaiah seems to have possessed, and without which Jeremiah and his disciples could not possibly have converted the unspiritual minds of their countrymen. Nor must our inherited prejudices hinder us from assimilating the lesson of Jewish history—that it was the combination of legal and prophetic elements which alone saved Israel, and enabled it to remain unmoved, though not unaltered, amidst the tempests of the centuries.

[1] *Syrian Stone-lore*, p. 126; cp. Vincent, *Canaan* (1907), p. 423.

[2] Erman, *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, p. 64.—'It is easy to understand that for ten or twenty years the new faith actually prevailed, at least among the upper classes of the people.' The qualification is important.

CHAPTER IV

JEREMIAH'S ATTITUDE. JOSIAH'S DEFEAT AND DEATH. FEAR OF THE NORTH ARABIANS

WE have seen that the traditional account of Josiah's reformation is in some respects not fully trustworthy, and it would be natural to hope that the Book which bears the name of Jeremiah would compensate us for our disappointment. To some extent it certainly does, but only on condition of our applying a keen criticism to the contents. Scholars like Duhm and Cornill are well aware of this, and the experience of the last half-century has taught them to distinguish better than their predecessors between that which is and that which is not genuine in this prophetic collection. They have also, perhaps I may say, learned more fully that the non-genuine passages by which a redactor has supplemented the fragmentary relics of the true Jeremiah may contain valuable material for the later history of Israel's religion.

There is one result of recent criticism which is of special importance for the history of the reformation. Through insufficient criticism of chap. xi., which certainly contains some work of Jeremiah's, the French scholar Dahler (1825-30) was led to believe that Jeremiah was so friendly to the reformation that he actually became an itinerating advocate of the claims of Deuteronomy. Not in deference to Josiah, but following an inward divine call, he is thought to have proclaimed 'all these words (*i.e.* the words of this covenant) in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem.' The passage on which this view is based is Jer. xi. 1-8, which is not only poor in diction and devoid of

metre,[1] but quite out of harmony with what Jeremiah says elsewhere. Take for instance Jer. viii. 8,

> How can ye say, We are wise,
> And the *tōrah* of Yahweh is with us?
> Verily, into a lie has he made it[2]
> The lying pen of scribes.

Could there be a plainer contradiction of those who asserted that they had Yahweh's direction in a written form? And how can one who wrote thus have been a friend of Deuteronomy and the reformation?

Nevertheless, Jeremiah was at one with Josiah in his abhorrence of the Baalistic religion established by Manasseh. What the religion of Jerusalem was like before the reformation can be seen from Jer. ii. 28 *b* (see 𝔊). This is how, most probably, the text originally ran,—

> For as many cities as thou hast,
> So many gods hadst thou,
> And as many streets as Jerusalem has,
> So many sacrifices have they burned to Baal.

Some early scribe altered the text of the fourth line, which in the M.T. runs thus, 'so many altars have ye set up to Bosheth, altars to burn sacrifices to Baal.' The scribe's explanation is perfectly good, only we must restore the name of Baal's consort, here miscalled בשת (Bosheth), to its true form שבעית = ישמעית, one of the titles of the great N. Arabian goddess and consort of Baal.[3] To Jeremiah, the most damning sin of his people is frequenting the house of Ashtart. This appears from Jer. xi. 15, where the opening words should run, 'What has my beloved to do in the house of Ashtart';[4] also from Jer. v. 7, where the Israelites are accused of cutting their flesh (to propitiate the deity)[5] in the

[1] The most certain prophecies of Jeremiah are distinguished by their metrical character.

[2] Reading עָשָׂה with Cornill and virtually Duhm. Driver's 'hath wrought falsely' is surely too vague.

[3] See *T. and B.* p. 18.

[4] Reading עשתרת, for עשותה. Cp. on שאת, Gen. xlix. 3 (*T. and B.* p. 500); also on Judg. xiii. 19, Hab. i. 7.

[5] Cp. Dt. xiv. 1, 1 K. xviii. 28, Jer. xvi. 6, xli. 5, xlvii. 5, Mic. iv. 14.

house of Ṣibeonah.[1] We may also compare Jer. vii. 17 *f.*, where, 'in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem' the prophet sees the ritual cakes being prepared for the 'queen of heaven,'[2] *i.e.* for Ashtart.

On the popular religion of Judah which, as we shall see, revived after Josiah's death, I shall speak again in chap. v. I have now to follow our only authorities, who pass abruptly from the religious revolution to the ill-advised warlike undertaking in which Josiah met his death. How gladly would we have had more information alike as to the years of peace which preceded and as to the disaster itself! I have already treated this subject,[3] but must return to it again in this connexion.

The text of 2 K. xxiii. 29 runs thus,—'In his days Pharaoh-Neko, king of Egypt, went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates; and king Josiah went to meet him; and he slew him at Megiddo when he saw him.'

A number of questions now suggest themselves. Thus, with regard to Josiah. (1) Was it ambition that stimulated him (p. 26), an ambition which may have been strengthened by the belief that Yahweh was now on good terms with his people? It may have seemed worth while even to run a considerable risk for the prize of the hegemony of the peoples of Palestine. It is probable, however, that Josiah's ambition was of a more limited range, and was satisfied by the occupation of the N. Arabian border-land. (2) Did Josiah fight among other Assyrian vassals against the foe of his suzerain?[4] But the growing dangers which now beset Assyria must surely have incapacitated its king from putting any pressure upon Palestinian rulers. Ever since the death of Ashur-bani-pal 'the air must have been filled with rumours of rebellion and with murmurs of dread concerning the future.'[5] Or (3) Did several Phœnician and Palestinian

[1] זונה is a corruption, probably not undesigned, of צענה *i.e.* צבעונה. Ṣibeon = Ishmael (*T. and B.* p. 19, n. 1).

[2] But see *T. and B.* p. 18.

[3] 'The Decline of the Kingdom of Judah,' *Nineteenth Century and After*, May 1908, pp. 811-818.

[4] W. Max Müller, *Studien zur vorderasiat. Geschichte*, p. 54 *f.*; cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Necho.'

[5] Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, ii. 285.

princes combine on their own account against the new would-be suzerain under the leadership of Josiah?

Next, with regard to 'Pharaoh-Neko.' There are arguments which have to be considered both for and against the traditional view. It must be admitted that an ambitious Egyptian king might well determine to profit by the decay of Assyria, and revive the ancient claims of Egypt to the overlordship of Syria and Palestine. The sovereign of Egypt at this time was Ne-ka-u or Nikû (= Heb. Neko) II., the son and successor of Psametik I. (26th dynasty). His enterprising character is sufficiently clear[1] from Herodotus (ii. 158 *f.*), who states, near the end of his eulogy, that Nekôs 'made war by land on the Syrians, and defeated them in a pitched battle at Magdolon, after which he took Kadytis, a large city of Syria.' That the Syrians here referred to are the Assyrians,[2] seems most unlikely; the battle intended is most probably that in which Josiah fell, only the scene of the contest is, not Megiddo, but Migdol. There were of course many Migdols; Winckler thinks of Cæsarea; my own view will be mentioned presently. As to Kadytis, in Herod. iii. 5 it is thought to be Gaza; here, according to Prašek,[3] it is Kadesh on the Orontes. This, however, depends on our general view of the narrative.

To the statement of Herodotus we may add the evidence of a small monument found (it is said) at Sidon. It is a fragment of a thin tablet of basalt, on which is part of a royal figure holding staff and mace. In front of this is a scrap of a cartouche with the legs of a bird remaining.[4] The cartouche is that of Niku II. The fragment having probably been found at Sidon suggests that in Phœnicia at any rate Nikû had acted as suzerain.

I am afraid, however, that neither Herodotus nor the basalt slab supplies perfectly decisive evidence. The 'father of history' had no immunity from error. In the present case he may have confounded a little-known N. Arabian

[1] The circumnavigation of Africa is now proved by Bouriant's scarabs.

[2] S. Reinach, *Revue archéologique*, xxvii. 366.

[3] *Forschungen zur Gesch. des Alterthums*, ii. pp. 3 *f.*

[4] F. Ll. Griffith, 'A Relic of Pharaoh Necho from Phœnicia,' *PSBA*, Jan. 1894, pp. 10 *f.*

king with a well-known king of Egypt, just as, in ii. 141, he or his authority apparently confounded a little-known king of the Arabian Asshurites with a well-known king of Assyria.[1] And as to the slab of basalt, it will only prove that Niku had close relations with Sidon, not that he defeated Josiah, and became suzerain, as the M.T. of xxiv. 7 tells us, of the territory between the torrent of Egypt and the river Euphrates.

Against the opinion that Nikû really did what he is commonly represented to have done, these arguments may be adduced. (1) It is not in itself probable that an Egyptian king should have intervened in the affairs of Palestine without there being any reference to this in the prophetic writings. On a close critical examination of the occurrences of מצרים in the prophets, we find that by this name not Egypt, but the N. Arabian Muṣr or Muṣri is generally intended. Of references to a possible Egyptian domination of Judah there is no trace. It is true, the prophets do not mention everything, nor have we all that they wrote. But what external evidence of such a domination is there? (2) There are only two cases of the prefixing of פרעה to the name of a king of מצרים; 'Pharaoh-Neko' is one, 'Pharaoh-Hophra' is the other. Now Hophra (see p. 80) forms no part of the true text of Jer. xliv. 30; it is probable therefore that Neko too should be omitted. פרעה should probably be פרעו, 'the name (as we may suppose) of some Miṣrite king who became famous. At any rate, it (Pir'u) was the name of a king of Muṣri in Sargon's time.[2] 3. In 2 K. xxiii. 34 we are told that the Miṣrite king changed the Judaite king's birth-name Eliakim to Jehoiakim. Had the suzerain been an Egyptian, he would have given his vassal a name connecting him in some way, secular or religious, with Egypt. 4. In the parallel, 2 Chr. xxxv. 21, Neko sends a message to Josiah, which, from a religious point of view,[3] would be entirely

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Sennacherib,' § 5; *Crit. Bib.* p. 393. The Sethos of Herodotus is surely Seti, and not, as Prašek supposes, Taharḳa, nor, as W. M. Müller (*Eg. Researches*, p. 33), Merneptah.

[2] *T. and B.* p. 223.

[3] Note the emphatic reference to Elohim, and cp. an Asshurite's reference to Yahweh in 2 K. xviii. 25 (see p. 89).

congenial to that king. Surely the writer on whom the Chronicler depends had in view, not a king of Egypt, but one in some respects not unlike the N. Arabian king or chieftain Abimelech in Gen. xx.[1]

We see, then, that there is evidence both for and against an Egyptian intervention in Judah, and it may not unreasonably be held that the arguments against it are on the whole the weightier. That the final editors or redactors of Kings and Chronicles, and of the headings of Jer. xlvi. and xlvii., believed in that intervention, may be granted, but we cannot tie ourselves to their opinions or surmises. It is possible that, like Herodotus, they made a confusion between two different kings. The king who really intervened was a Miṣrite of N. Arabia, but they, like Herodotus, confounded him with a better known king of Miṣraim. The textual results of this view are, that Par'oh should probably be Pir'u,[2] that Neko (Nekoh) should be omitted, that Miṣraim should be Miṣrim, that Karkemish (Chronicles, Hebrew but not Greek) is miswritten or substituted for Reḳem-Kush[3] (= Kushite Yarḥam), that Megiddo should be Migdol (one of the southern Migdols; see Jer. xliv. 1, for a Miṣrite Migdol), and that the highly improbable phrase (2 K. xxiii. 29) כראתו אתו, 'when he saw him,' should be corrected in the light of the preceding emendations. Exegetically, too, some changes are necessary. Asshur is not Assyria,[4] but the territory of a king who at any rate claimed to be suzerain of all the Yeraḥme'elite kingdoms, including Miṣrim. Perāth is not the Euphrates but the Ephrath, a N. Arabian district.[5]

And now as to the words in 2 K. xxiii. 29, in which the latest commentator finds the suggestion of an assassination, paraphrasing, 'the Egyptians killed him (Josiah) in Megiddo as soon as he came within sight of their king.'[6] One would be sorry if criticism could do no better than that! From

[1] See further below.
[2] *T. and B.* p. 223.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 170 *f.*, 179.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 171-173.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 91, 262; and below, on Dt. i. 7.
[6] Barnes, *Kings* (Cambr. Bible), 1908, p. 316. Winckler and Benz. suggest בְּהֵרָאוֹת אֹתוֹ, which is improbable. See also *E. Bib.* col. 2611 (n. 1).

our point of view, and granting the value of experience of recurring types of corruption, the text which has most probability leaps into view. אתו is a dittograph which arose after the preceding word had been corrupted. That word is the astonishing כראתו. ראתו has come by transposition from אתור, and this (one letter being dropped, as in אחר from אשחר) represents אשתור, an incorrect form of אשתר. כ, naturally, has come from ב. Thus Josiah fell 'in Ashtar.' The place or region was, or had been, dedicated to the god Ashtar (the masc. of Ashtart). 'It was against such a deity that Josiah had striven. But what did the place-name matter, if only the dangerous N. Arabian cults were abolished'? That Ashtar is sometimes = Asshur and Ashḥur, has been pointed out elsewhere;[1] it is one of the regional names of the N. Arabian border-land.

That names such as Miṣrim, Asshur, Ashtar, were used by the Hebrew writers with historical precision, no scholar would assert. A change in the dominant race involves the introduction of new ethnics and regional names. Still the old names are tenaciously preserved by neighbouring peoples and used by their writers. Nor could I, of course, maintain that 2 Chr. xxxv. 21 *f.* correctly represents the relation of the two religions—the Judaite and the contemporary 'Miṣrite.' According to this passage, the Miṣrite king knows and reveres Elohim (*i.e.* Yahweh), from whom he receives oracles, either directly, through travelling prophets of Yahweh (cp. Elijah, 1 K. xix. 15), or indirectly, through information, somehow obtained, as to Hebrew prophecies against Asshur[2] (cp. Cyrus's reference to II. Isaiah, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 23).

I will now endeavour to sketch the outlines of the historical and exegetical picture. At the end of Josiah's reign the king of Miṣrim conceived the idea of annexing the N. Arabian borderland of Judah. This territory was claimed by the king of Asshur, but had been occupied by

[1] *T. and B.* p. 70.

[2] ‖ Esd. i. 28, 'Howbeit Josias . . . presumed to fight with him, not regarding the words of the prophet Jeremias (spoken) by the mouth of the Lord.' Jeremiah, however, does not seem well-chosen (cp. Jer. xlvi. 1 *f.*).

Josiah, as the vassal of the Asshurite suzerain. In this capacity, and perhaps with the help of Asshurite troops, Josiah went out in the direction of the stream of Ephrath, to meet the Miṣrites.[1] The battle-field was near a Migdol, or fortified tower, in a district called Reḳem-Kush or Ashtar. Josiah was mortally wounded, and had to be conveyed to Jerusalem in another chariot. A comparison of 2 Chr. xxxv. 24 with Gen. xli. 43 enables us to say what this chariot was; it was one of those which passed among the Israelites as 'Ishmael-chariots'[2] (see p. 18). In an earlier form of the text it was merely stated that Josiah's men removed him (his own command was, 'Remove me') to Jerusalem on the Ishmael-chariot which he had. He died, universally mourned (2 Chr. xxxv. 24). How highly Jeremiah respected him, we shall see later.

The tragedy of this king's death may be variously interpreted. It is often held to consist in the disappointment of his earnest faith that having obeyed the prescriptions of legal righteousness he was sure of the divine protection against his enemies. But it may also be considered to arise from the fact which we have just now brought to light that Josiah sacrificed his life in the cause of a foreign despot, whom all in Judah but a few interested partisans agreed in hating. The evidence of this strong national feeling is to be derived from the prophets. This may seem to many impossible, but a keen scrutiny will show that Nahum, for instance, is thinking, not of Assyria but of Asshur when he says (iii. 19), 'All that hear the report of thee shall clap the hands over thee.'

Certainly it is of N. Arabia that he is thinking when he bids Nineveh, or the city whose name underlies 'Nineveh,' take warning by the fate of No-Amon (iii. 8-11). If I may be allowed a brief digression, this appears from two parallel and interdependent passages, which Nahum evidently has in

[1] Observe, it is not said, as we should have expected, 'and the king of Asshur went to meet him,' but 'and king Josiah went to meet him'; so 'king Josiah' must in some sense be equivalent to 'the king of Asshur.'

[2] On the rarity of chariots in Judah see Duhm on Isa. xxii. 18; the passage, however, originally said nothing of chariots. For מרכבות נבוך read קבורתך, 'thy sepulchre.'

mind. The first is Isa. x. 9-11,[1] where Asshur (*v.* 5), *i.e.* the king of Asshur (which, as a gloss tells us, is 'in Yarḥam'[2]) arrogantly declares that, as he has done to certain other cities, so he will now do to Jerusalem. Where are those other cities? A careful scrutiny shows that they are in N. Arabia. Jerusalem, says the king, cannot expect to fare better at the hands of the N. Arabian Asshur than Kalno (?) and Reḳem-Kūsh, Ḥamath and Arpakshad, Shimron and Ramshaḳ. The second is Am. vi. 2,[3] where the Israelites are bidden to study the fate of Kalneh (?), Ḥamath of Arabia, Gath of the Pelethites. Except Jerusalem, all the cities spoken of in these passages are most probably N. Arabian. It is therefore *a priori* likely that No-Amon in Nah. iii. 8 is a corruption of some N. Arabian place-name. That it can hardly be the Egyptian Thebes, W. Max Müller has shown;[4] some city in the Delta, standing on a mound and surrounded by canals, would be more conceivable.

If we are right (as surely we are) in grouping the three parallel passages, and interpreting them on the same lines, it is plain that unless there is any strong objection drawn from the rest of Nahum (omitting the spoiled alphabetic poem at the beginning), the city of the oppressors is in N. Arabia, and presumably one of the chief cities of the Asshurite kingdom. As for objections, the strongest (if correct) would be the occurrence in Nah. iii. 17 of two Assyrian loan-words under the forms מנזר and מספסר. The Assyriological explanations,[5] however, though tempting, are not suitable enough, and against these supposed indications of Assyria may be placed several possible or probable references to N. Arabia.[6] 'Nineveh' therefore, in ii. 8, iii. 7, must be a

[1] Karkemish is no doubt a real name, but it is substituted here for רקם־כוש (see p. 37). ארפד is a short way of writing ארפכשד, on which see *T. and B.* p. 178. רמשח = רמשק (*T. and B.* p. 249).

[2] הוא בירם should be הוא בירחם. That הוא often introduces a gloss, is well-known. See Introduction.

[3] Underneath חמת רבה lies probably עֶבֶד ח'; under פלשתים lies פלחים, *i.e.* אחבעלים (*T. and B.* p. 192; and cp. on 'Tophel,' Dt. i. 1).

[4] *E. Bib.*, 'No-Amon.'

[5] See *Crit. Bib.* p. 169; *E. Bib.*, 'Scribe,' § 4.

[6] *E.g.* מאדם, מחלעים, and הרעלי (ii. 4), which are probably corrupt fragments of N. Arabian ethnics. Also the place-names in iii. 8 *f.*

corruption. The original name can most probably still be traced underneath it. The initial *n* is a dittograph; what follows should be read 'Yewanah' (יונה). It is a feminine form of יָנָן = יָמָן, a shortened form of ירחמאל.[1] All that need be added is, that, as the heading informs us, Nahum, like Huldah the prophetess, was an Israelite of North Arabia.[2]

The digression is over. Has it not become evident that if any Hebrew poet, projecting himself into the future, raised a song of triumph over the fall of Nineveh, it was not Nahum? Also that for anything that we have lost we have been adequately compensated? A prophetic song of triumph over N. Arabian oppressors is not to be undervalued. And we can see now that there was an added bitterness in the lamentations for Josiah in the thought that he fell in the cause of an abhorred tyrant. And yet, if he had not gone out to contend with the Miṣrites, might not some worse thing have happened? For, not without excuse, dread of the Asshurites oppressed the minds of all the people of Judah. Jeremiah himself gives the most powerful descriptions of the foe, one of which I will quote.[3]

Behold, he cometh up as clouds, | and like a whirlwind are his chariots;
Swifter than eagles are his horses; woe unto us! we are destroyed (iv. 13).
Bow and spear they grasp, | cruel are they, without compassion;
Their voice roareth as the sea, | on horses do they ride,
Arrayed like a man for war | against thee, O maiden Zion.
We have heard the report thereof; | our hands slacken;
Anguish hath seized us, | pain as of a woman with child.
Go not forth into the field, | nor walk in the way,
For there is the sword of the foeman. | (*Gloss*, Gomer Ishmael.)

[1] See Introduction, and cp. *T. and B.* pp. 160 *f.*, 188.

[2] 'Nahum the Elkoshite' should be 'Nahum the Ashkalite.' On Ashkal, see *T. and B.* pp. 18 (n. 4), 23, 40 (n. 3).

[3] It will be noticed that for מגור מסביב I read גֹּמֶר יסב; cp. יָבָם, the name of a branch of the Ishmaelites.

O my people, gird thee with sackcloth, | wallow in ashes,
Make for thee the mourning of an only son, | bitter lamentation (vi. 23-26 *a*).

Again and again the invasion is spoken of, and even Jeremiah's supplementers knew how to write what, except in form and style, recalls Jeremiah. It is from Ṣaphon that the invasion comes (see Jer. i. 13-15, vi. 1, 22); all are agreed about that. To render 'the north' introduces an intolerable vagueness; a large number of passages (see *e.g.* Isa. xiv. 13, xiv. 31, Jer. xlvi. 6, Ezek. xxxviii. 6), have become obscure in consequence. Ṣaphon is really the name of a region; it is a dialect form of Ṣibeʿon, *i.e.* Ishmael.[1] A passage from Zephaniah (ii. 12 *f.*), who must have been contemporary with Jeremiah, will further illustrate, not only this point, but also the strong feeling of the time against the N. Arabian peoples called (loosely enough, probably) Kush and Asshur.

Ye too, O Kushites, (shall be) | slain by my sword.
And I will turn my hand against Ṣaphon, | and destroy Asshur;
And I will make Yewānah [see p. 41] a desolation, | dry like the wilderness.

The two following verses[2] are also interesting. Verse 15 indeed must be a later insertion, but it is at any rate a judicious one. Just as *v.* 14 has points of contact with the oracle on Bābel in Isa. xiii., so has *v.* 15 with the taunting song on Bābel in Isa. xlvii. To appreciate this, let us remember that Yewānah and Bābel both belong to the great kingdom of Nimrod (Gen. x. 10 *f.*) often spoken of as Asshur, but also sometimes, by a lax usage, as Bābel. By good fortune the 'exultant city' of Zeph. ii. 15 is explained by a gloss to be 'the city of Yewānah.' The gloss penetrated into the text of iii. 1, the words עיר יונה being misread

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 32, 50 (n. 3). Ishmael, or Yeraḥme'el, and Asshur may be used in a wide sense.

[2] I leave the strophes (see Marti) undetermined.

by the redactor עִיר יוֹנָה, after which each word was provided with an article.[1]

Such was the feeling towards the troublesome peoples of N. Arabia not unnaturally entertained by their less warlike neighbours. Let us now pass on to the unhappy story of Josiah's successors.

[1] The other occurrences of יָוָה (Ḳal) are in Jer. xlvi. 16, l. 16, and no doubt also Jer. xxv. 38. In each case we should read חֶרֶב הַיְוָנִי, 'the sword of the Yawanite.' On 'Yawan' see Introduction.

CHAPTER V

JEHOAHAZ—JEHOIAKIM—HIS CONTEST WITH JEREMIAH —PORTRAITS OF KINGS IN JEREMIAH—JEHOIAKIM TO HAVE NO PUBLIC MOURNING—LITANY OF LAMENTATION, ITS VALUE FOR THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.

It was a perilous time. The king had been defeated and had died of his wound, and no one could tell what would be the conqueror's conditions of peace. The 'people of the land'—those who were freemen and proprietors—took Jehoahaz, a son of Josiah, and anointed him as king (2 K. xxiii. 30, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 1). He was twenty-three years old. The 'epitome' in 2 K. xxiii. 32 speaks badly of him; doubtless in the same sense, and with as much or as little cause, as in the case of his successor Jehoiachin. For reasons of his own the Miṣrite king was discontented with Jehoahaz. Perhaps of his own accord, or perhaps sent for, Jehoahaz went to the Miṣrite head-quarters at Riblah in the land of Hamath. We must remember that there was a southern as well as a northern Ḥamath;[1] most probably there was also a southern Riblah; both names seem to be Yeraḥme'elite.[2] The alternative is to suppose that we have here a mixture of the reports of two distinct invasions, one Egyptian, the other N. Arabian.

Three months, no more, had the reign of Jehoahaz (or

[1] See *T. and B.* p. 196. 'Riblah' is generally supposed to have been on Israel's ideal northern or north-eastern border (Num. xxxiv. 11, Ezek. vi. 14). In Ezek. xlvii. 16 Ḥamath seems to take the place of Riblah. See *E. Bib.*, 'Riblah.'

[2] Cp. יִרְבְּעָל and אַרְבֵּל.

Shallum; see p. 49) lasted. Very possibly it was not so much 'the people of the land' who made him king, as a royal lady, whose combined energy and ambition check-mated the adherents of Josiah's eldest son. This lady was Jehoahaz's mother Hamuṭal (חמוטל), who, in Ezek. xix. 2, is represented allegorically as a lioness.[1] She was also the mother of the well-meaning but incapable Zedekiah, to whom we shall return. Her name may be connected with the southern place-name Ḥamath (see above); cp. חמטה, Josh. xv. 54. Her favourite son Jehoahaz was succeeded by Nekō's nominee Jehoiakim, who was twenty-five years old, and whose mother was named Zebudah.[2] It is this lady who is referred to in Jer. xiii. 18 as 'Mistress,' this being the title of that exalted personage the queen-mother. The king's own name had been Eliakim; the Miṣrite king (more competent, surely, than the Egyptian Nikū) changed it to the equally Judaite name Jehoiakim[3] (cp. 2 K. xxiv. 17). This was merely a sign of his overlordship; we can hardly suppose, with Professor H. P. Smith, that a contrast is intended between the meaning of 'Jehoahaz' and that of 'Jehoiakim.' Regarding these names as religious, there is no substantial difference between them.

Jehoiakim is reported to have reigned eleven years.[4] His first business was to raise a large sum of money either as a war-fine or (Winckler's opinion) as an acknowledgment of the conqueror's royal grace in placing him on the throne. It is disappointing that so little should be told us in 2 Kings of this important period. Fortunately we are helped by the Book of Jeremiah, for though narratives from the prophet's biography cannot be trusted in all details, yet we may assume that they have at any rate more or less foundation in traditional facts. The Book also contains (see p. 32), genuine prophecies of Jeremiah, and these are of course first-rate historical sources.

[1] See Kraetzschmar, *Ezechiel, ad loc.*

[2] Cp. Zabud (1 K. iv. 5), Zebadiah (son of Yeroham = Yarḥam, 1 Chr. xii. 7; in Ezra viii. 8, son of Mika'el = Yeraḥme'el).

[3] Eliakim interchanges with Jehoiakim as Ilubi'di with Yāubi'di (names of a king of Hamath).

[4] See 2 K. xxiii. 36; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 5. Kittel questions the tradition. In fact our evidence is too scanty to permit either affirmation or denial.

It is best, wherever this can be done, not to mix up heterogeneous material. Let us therefore begin with some narratives and prophecies from the Book referred to. This involves putting Jeremiah very much in the foreground, but how can we avoid doing so? The evidence before us clearly shows that Jehoiakim and Jeremiah were the two great powers in the land, even though the action of the latter was not marked by the usual signs of success. What Jeremiah was, we have seen; he belonged neither to Hilkiah's reforming party, nor to the party of the heathen reaction; one thing he did, both in season and out of season, he preached the necessity of spiritual conversion. Jehoiakim, on the other hand, was the impersonation of the Baalistic revival. His name, it is true, may plausibly be offered as evidence for his Yahwism, and the narrative in chap. xxxvi. may be taken to imply that he was no Baal-worshipper. But while not denying that Yahu is one element in the king's religious name, I cannot hold that Jehoiakim is rightly described as a Yahwist. It is certain from Jer. vii. 9, 18[1] that the people at large worshipped Baal and Ashtart, as well as 'other gods'; the reference surely is to the early part of Jehoiakim's reign, when the reaction was again in full force.

Into the question of the position of Baal and Ashtart in astral mythology we need not enter at length. Inscriptions appear to suggest that at a late period Yerahmeel (= Ba'al) was identified with the sun-god, and many besides Schrader (*l.c.*) have taken Ashtart to be the moon-goddess, in spite of the fact that the Babylonian Ishtar was connected with Venus. Theologians may have seen the sun and moon deities in Ba'al and Ashtart, but the people at large, always conservative, doubtless retained earlier conceptions, even if some of them were inconsistent, also a popular failing. She was above all, the goddess of fertility, and we can well understand what treasures of love and gratitude were poured out upon the Dōdah or friend (p. 54). But to those whose view of religion was fundamentally ethical, Ashtart was not a good but an evil goddess. The consecrated prostitutes

[1] Cp. Schrader, *Sitzungsber. der königl. Preuss. Akad.*, 1886, xxviii. 11; Zimmern, *KAT*(3), p. 441.

belonged to her, and how much the ethical religionists abhorred the custom referred to, we see again and again. To admit such a deity as Ashtart into the Divine Company was revolting.[1] That the people beloved of Yahweh should be found in the house of Ashtart (Jer. xi. 15, see p. 33), was an insult to Yahweh. What indeed was a Yahweh who would tolerate Ashtart as his companion? How could such a Yahweh be the God of Israel?

In Jer. xxxvi. we have a record, partly fact, partly fancy, of a duel between the representatives of the two Yahwehs, not unlike the great contest, now in the remote past, between Ahab and Elijah. Certainly the combatants do not meet face to face, but Jehoiakim knows full well that the roll which he treats with a kind of personal hatred has been dictated by Jeremiah, and in fact makes an attempt to arrest Jeremiah and his scribe (*v.* 26). The date of the occurrence is the fifth year of Jehoiakim, an important year as we shall see later. The occasion is the recitation of the contents of a roll of prophecies. A temple-fast is about to be proclaimed for the citizens of Jerusalem and for any of the country-folk who may come in. Jeremiah seizes the opportunity for making public the summary of his discourses which his scribe has lately written. He cannot indeed do this himself; for some reason he considers himself forbidden to enter the temple. But Baruch is ready to be his deputy. A room is offered to him within the sacred precincts that he may read the prophecies in public. Afterwards the princes in their council-chamber send for Baruch. They too desire to hear the roll, but when they have heard it they seem to regret their temerity, for, we are told, they turn tremblingly one to another, and say to Baruch, 'We will surely report all these words to the king.'

'We all know the sequel. Jehoiakim sends for the scroll. It is December; Jehoiakim is sitting in the "winter house," and there is a fire burning in the fire-pan or brasier.

[1] The male deity Asshur might have been less glaringly repulsive. Once indeed (Jer. xvii. 2) Jeremiah speaks against *ashērīm* (= *asshūrīm*, symbols of Asshur), but in the genuine prophecies of Isaiah they are not once mentioned. See below, on Dt. xii. 2; Cheyne, *Introd. to Bk. of Isaiah*, p. 93; *T. and B.* pp. 24*f.*

A group of courtiers stands in the background. Jehudi comes forward and reads first one column, then another, and then another. But the proud king can bear it no longer; he rises, he steps forward—three high officers in vain attempt to check him—he snatches the scroll from the reader's hands, —he cuts it, with a cruel kind of pleasure, into piece after piece, and throws it into the fire. Then, as he watches the curling fragments, he dispatches three other high officers to arrest the prophet and the scribe on a charge of high treason.'[1]

The details of chap. xxxvi. have been much questioned. The second narrative which I have to mention is a simpler one, and is equally instructive as an illustration of Jehoiakim's attitude towards the prophet. It is to be found in Jer. xxvi., and the address which Jeremiah, according to this narrative, delivered in the temple, appears to form some part of Jer. vii. 3-viii. 3.[2] The date of the episode is placed (see Jer. xxvi. 1) 'in the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim'; any specially important words in this address may therefore very possibly have been repeated on that other critical occasion described in chap. xxxvi.

'It appears that some great festival, or possibly fast, had brought together a large number of people from all quarters to the temple, and that Jeremiah was directed to stand between the inner and outer court and address them. . . . When they heard these echoing words of relentless doom, "This temple shall become like Shiloh,"[3] they seized him. But in the nick of time a fresh power appeared on the scene—the "princes," or high officers of the state, who came up from their place of deliberation in the "king's house" (*v.* 10; cp. xxxvi. 12) and apparently the "elders," some of whom had doubtless taken part in Josiah's reformation. Jeremiah in dignified terms defended his own right to prophesy, and warned the people of the consequences of their act.[4] How the 'princes' interfered, denying the

[1] Cheyne, *Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, p. 144.

[2] Duhm, however, thinks that Jer. vii. 3-15 gives the most correct idea of Jeremiah's address.

[3] See *T. and B.* pp. 502 *f.*

[4] Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, etc., pp. 115, 120.

existence of a crime, and how certain elders appealed, in Jeremiah's interest, to the precedent of Micaiah or Micah (cp. Mic. iii. 12) need not be related anew. It is noteworthy that Jehoiakim is not here said to have interposed; presumably he endorsed the decision. Here we may pause, trusting that, even though not from Jeremiah's hand, a true tradition lies at the heart of it.

But without the shadow of a doubt we may refer to a cycle of beautiful poems (xxii. 10-19, 24, 28, 30 [part]) as historical authorities and as faithful representations of Jeremiah's attitude towards the kings. For they are admittedly Jeremiah's work. They contain portraits of the kings Jehoahaz (here called Shallum), Jehoiakim, and Jehoiachin (here called Coniahu). There is also an incidental eulogy of Josiah, in whose death the poet sees no call for beating of the breast in lamentation.[1] I shall here consider only the portraits of the first two of these kings, reserving that of Jehoiachin for a later page.

I need hardly remind the student that the central poem (that on Jehoiakim) is so extremely difficult in our text that almost all commentators allow themselves the liberty of emendation. It is all the more pleasant to admit that in the short elegy on Shallum (*vv.* 10-12) the meaning is transparently clear. This, however, is partly due to an interpolated gloss, which spoils the metre, while it gratifies the expositor. It is on the name Shallum, and informs us that it was this king who 'reigned instead of his father Josiah,' and who 'went forth from this place,' so that Shallum must be the birth-name, and the (to us) more familiar Jehoahaz the royal or accession-name of Josiah's successor. Of the young prince's character the poet says nothing; what were three months either for forming or for showing a character? But what he does say is at any rate sympathetic, *i.e.* it reveals a sense of the pathos of Shallum's fate. And in some degree this may be affirmed of Ezekiel (xix. 1-4). Surely such glimpses of contemporary feeling infuse new life into the dry statements of chronicles and epitomes.

Of the successor of Jehoahaz Jeremiah gives us a more

[1] Contrast 2 Chr. xxxv. 25, 'and Jeremiah lamented for Josiah.'

definite appreciation, though the details cause much trouble to the commentators. The usual view is thus summarised by Prof. H. P. Smith.[1] 'At a time when his kingdom was impoverished by the exactions of Egypt, he was possessed by the royal mania for building. He was more concerned to vie with Ahab [see Note] in the beauty of his palace, "panelled with cedar and painted with vermilion," than he was to follow his father's example in administering justice.' I confess that I cannot find this view satisfactory. Certainly, to build elegant palaces in the newest style at such a time—when all that part of the East was in a ferment—would have been as blameworthy as Nero's fiddling when Rome was burning. But is it likely that Jehoiakim's offence was mere frivolity or blindness to the signs of the times? The commentators, it is true, admit that the received text is rather uncertain. It is far more than this, it is so improbable that it demands a thorough re-examination. To refer here only to a single detail. Why should Jehoiakim be censured for vying with Ahab or Ahaz, when either Solomon or some foreign king (say Nebuchadrezzar) was so very much more clearly marked out as the lover of cedar-wood?

I venture to hope that at least some of my new suggestions may approximate to the truth. I hold that the original text of the passage contained references to certain fortified places captured by Jehoiakim. These references became indistinct (though Ferdinand Hitzig, many centuries after, to some extent divined them) owing to corruption of the text; indeed, the whole context offers problems which urgently need a new and more methodical treatment. Evidently the passage was already corrupt when it reached the final editor of Jeremiah, who, to produce an apparent sense, skilfully manipulated or revised the material, without, however, removing all traces of the original text. What that text contained, I have endeavoured to show. It was not palaces but fortresses to which Jehoiakim directed his attention. Josiah, as we have seen, had occupied the portions of the N. Arabian border-land which had formerly belonged at intervals to the kingdom of Israel. This territory had to be protected against N. Arabian raids, and Jehoiakim was

[1] *Old Testament History*, p. 282.

enough of a king to recognise the duty of fortifying it. In this he did but follow the example of an earlier king of Judah (Jotham), who is reported to have built 'castles and forts' in his own portion of the region vaguely called Ashhur.[1] It was all the more necessary to do this because of his obligation to pay an annual tribute to his Misrite suzerain.

The fortifications were not perhaps on a large scale, but even so they could not have been erected without that forced labour so characteristic of the East.[2] One of the fortresses was probably at the place called Beth-Melek, a corrupt form which has come, through Beth-Rakmal (= Beth-Karmel), from Beth-Yeraḥme'el;[3] the place seems to have been equally coveted by Israelites and N. Arabians, and therefore to have been the scene of many a conflict. In Jer. xxii. 6 it is called Beth-Melek-Yehudah, doubtless an impossible name, which cannot be correctly written.[4] The probability is that both here and in 2 K. xxiii. 8 (see p. 28), יהוד׳ has been miswritten for ירח׳, *i.e.* ירחמאל. The explanation is all the more plausible, because now and only now do we understand the phrase in Jer. xxii. 6*b*, 'I will make thee . . . cities not inhabited? The meaning of this phrase, so baffling to most commentators, is, that Beth-Melek and its dependent towns will soon have to share the same terrible fate.[5]

Let us now return to the fortifications and the forced labour. The *corvée* may be an institution of venerable antiquity, but the prophet likes it none the better; evidently he is of the same school as the describer of the 'manner of

[1] 2 Chr. xxvii. 4. For ובחרשי׳ read ובאשחור.

[2] On Ḥammurabi's *corvée*, see Johns, *Bab. and Ass. Laws*, etc., 318.

[3] That מלך and כרמל both sometimes come from ירחמאל, has been indicated already. 'Beth-Yeraḥme'el' was also called 'Beth-Hakkerem' (Jer. vi. 1, Neh. iii. 14), and perhaps 'Beth-Arbel' (Hos. x. 14). The last-cited passage may serve as a commentary on Jer. xxii. 6 *f.*

[4] Duhm renders, 'For thus saith Yahweh on the house of the king of Judah'; Cornill, '. . . on the royal palace of Judah.' The former criticizes the heading as plainly incorrect; a royal house cannot become 'uninhabited cities.' The latter expatiates further on the impossibility. Oh, these poor supplementers and redactors! How absurd they often are! But may not the fault sometimes lie in ourselves?

[5] To avoid misunderstanding it may be remarked that Jer. xxii. 1-5 and *vv.* 6, 7 have no real connexion.

the king' in 1 S. viii. 11-18. Verses 14 and 15*a* are not out of harmony with *v.* 13, but the difficulties are such as to force us to suppose that they have been recast. Our only hope of approximately restoring the original lies in turning to account familiarity with the habits of the scribes. In the following translation of a text of *vv.* 13-16 corrected partly by this means and partly by consideration of the metre, some omissions will be noticed. These, however, are only glosses, and will be referred to and justified in the 'Note on Jer. xxii. 13-19, 24-30.'

He that buildeth castles with unrighteousness, | and fortresses with injustice;
That maketh his neighbour work for nought, | and giveth him not his wage;
That saith, I will build me castles | and forts in Yarḥam;
And he captured for himself Yaḥlon (?) in Ṣaphon, | and Ramshaḥ in Asshur.
Shalt thou go on reigning, because thou | goest to war with Ezraḥ?
Did not thy father perform | judgment and justice?
He redressed the wrongs of the poor and needy; | then he fared well;
Was not this to know me? | (This is) Yahweh's oracle.

It will be noticed that Josiah is praised, not for his patriotism, nor yet because he conducted his people to a new religious stage, but because, as supreme judge, he did justice to the oppressed poor. On the other hand, Jehoiakim is blamed, not for any want of patriotism, nor yet for religious backsliding, but because his building operations were carried on by forced labour. Verse 17 is a dull, prosaic sequel. It contains a number of vague charges, and, as Cornill points out, is probably a redactional insertion, designed to link together *vv.* 13-16 and 18-19.

The latter passage is probably of later origin than *vv.* 13-16, with which it is imperfectly connected by the particle כִּי, 'for.' The honour of a public mourning is refused to the unjust king.[1] How he was to die we are not

[1] The case of Jehoram would be a parallel. 'His people made no burning for him' (2 Chr. xxi. 19).

told, but from *v.* 19 Jeremiah would seem to have anticipated some great slaughter or massacre in which Jehoiakim perished (cp. Jer. xv. 3). The prophecy is genuine for it was not fulfilled (see 2 K. xxiv. 6), and no 'supplementer' would have ventured to produce an unfulfilled prophecy (Duhm). The closing words, 'beyond the gates of Jerusalem,' are, however, apparently due to such a person; we can hardly suppose Jeremiah to have meant what they say. And what is the most interesting point in the whole passage? As it seems to me neither of the two points which have been mentioned, but the very strange formulæ mentioned here as usual in the litany of lamentation. As the Hebrew text stands there are two double formulæ, (*a*) *hoi āḥī* and *hoi āḥōth*, and (*b*) *hoi ādōn*, and *hoi hōdōh*. 𝔊, it is true, gives only Ὦ ἀδελφέ and Οἴμοι κύριε, but is not to be followed; the translator omits two members because of their difficulty. How is this to be explained? Shall we suppose with Movers that the funeral procession consisted of two parts, each condoling with the other? Or that there is some hitherto lost meaning which it is for us, with the help of textual criticism, to recover? Surely the latter course is preferable, for experience shows that in the hardest cases the boldest course has the best chance of success. Let us, then, begin with that hard phrase, 'Alas! his glory.' Is it enough to explain with Hitzig, 'because with the death of the king his glory is put out'? Surely not; the formulæ have to be parallel, and the parallel word is אחות, a feminine form, which ought either to be a title or to cover over a proper name. From this we infer that underneath הדה there lies some other word in the feminine gender analogous in meaning to אחות. The word has actually been found by Bernhard Duhm, but not been rightly interpreted, for surely to render דודה 'aunt,'[1] produces a most unsatisfactory sense.

Those who are at home in Semitic mythology will at once divine the true interpretation. That Dōdah is a divine name we may assume from the existence of a divine name Dōd,[2] and we find it plainly enough in the inscription of

[1] So Duhm, remarking that among almost all nations the uncle and the aunt enjoy only less respect than the father and the mother.

[2] See *T. and B.* pp. 46-49, 379.

Mesha (l. 22), where Ar'al-Dōdah is the name of a compound deity worshipped by the Gadites, and also very probably by the Israelites at large. For we can hardly doubt but that Dōdah ('beloved') is another name for the great Canaanitish and N. Arabian goddess Ashtart. The Canaanitish myth of Dōdah or Ashtart has not reached us, but we know something about the Babylonian goddess Ishtar. The so-called 'Descent of Ishtar' may indeed present a highly developed form of the myth, but here—as in the case of textual developments—experience may qualify us to discern something older that lies underneath. That 'something' may perhaps be that Ishtar, the goddess of fertility, passes, stript of her glory, into the nether world, and while she is there the fertility and productivity of earth and its living beings are suspended. In Canaan, too, such a myth may have existed, and in connexion with it a ceremony of mourning for the vanished goddess. A similar story must have been told of the god of vegetation, known as Tamūz, and probably also as Adōn and Dōd.[1] Can we doubt any longer as to the meaning of Adōn and Dōdah in the old Hebrew litany? They are the original male and female deities of Canaan and N. Arabia.

Next, as to Aḥi and Aḥoth. Certainly no ordinary brother or sister, whether in the family or in the clan, can be meant. We shall not, however, understand the names till we recognise that אח and אחי are popular abbreviations of אחור, *i.e.* אשחור,[2] and that אחת and (Gen. xxx. 8) אחותי[3] may, consistently with recognised phenomena, have come from אַשְׁחֹרֶת,[4] a feminine form of אשחור. Both Ashḥūr (Ashḥōr) and Ashḥōreth are divine names, equivalent to Adōn and Dōdah.

But here I must guard the reader from drawing a false inference. It is true the formulæ in the primitive ritual lamentations for the dead god and goddess contained the four divine names Ashḥur (Ashḥor) and Ashḥoreth,

[1] See Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 573 *f.*

[2] *T. and B.* pp. 51, 308.

[3] Giesebrecht's reading אַחֻוָּתִי 'my brotherhood' will hardly find friends.

[4] *T. and B.* p. 377.

Adōn and Dōdah. Three of these, however, had most probably, before Jeremiah's time, become corrupted into Aḥi, Aḥoth, Hōdoh, and Adon might be applied to any human king. Thus to the prophet and his contemporaries the formulæ had no definite meaning, *i.e.* the collocations of words of which the formulæ consisted had become symbolic, and only suggested the vague idea of an extremely bitter lamentation. As a rule they were probably only used in public mournings, especially on the occasion of a king's death[1] (cp. Jer. xxxiv. 5), which makes it all the more interesting that in 1 K. xiii. 30 the lamentation formula for the 'man of God' who cried against the altar at Bethel is הוי אחי. It is possible that an eminent personage might be honoured at his death with a royal mourning. But the authority for this is late and we cannot press it.

Said I not right that the cycle of beautiful poems is of first-rate historical value? Even the formulæ of mourning are valuable for the history of religion.

[1] Frazer (*Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, pp. 11 *ff.*) thinks that at Byblus and elsewhere the king was required to personate the god of fertility (Baal or Adon) and marry the goddess (Baalath or Ashtart). Was it so in Canaan?

CHAPTER VI

JEHOIAKIM (*continued*)—THE INVASION (OR INVASIONS)—THE TWO BĀBELS—JEHOIACHIN—JEREMIAH'S AND EZEKIEL'S UTTERANCES—JEHOIACHIN'S CAPTIVITY—TURN IN HIS FORTUNES

THE beginning of Jehoiakim's reign was probably not altogether unhappy. The king was on good terms with his suzerain,[1] and paid his tribute punctually. He not only strengthened the fortresses which he already had in the Negeb, but captured two fortified places in the territory of Asshur. The gracious goddess Ashtart seemed to have befriended her worshippers, so that when strict Yahwists spoke up for a sterner morality such as the Yahwistic law-books—notably Deuteronomy—required, their advice was received coldly. 'I spoke to thee in thy careless ease,' says Yahweh by the mouth of Jeremiah, 'but thou saidst, I will not hear.' But the time was close at hand when that pleasant *insouciance* would have to be exchanged for the dread of coming evil. This is what the composite narrative in 2 K. xxiv. tells us. 'In his days Nebuchadnezzar king of Bābel came up, and Jehoiakim became his vassal three years; then he turned and rebelled against him.' Who, we ask, is this potentate, able to compel a rival king to relax his grasp on cities and lands? What do his name and title signify? Let us seek to be cautious, critical, and thorough. The question is not so easy to answer as it seems.

[1] One convenience of this was that Jehoiakim was able, upon occasion, to fetch troublesome prophets out of Miṣrim and put them to death (Jer. xxvi. 20-23). Extradition of offenders.

1. As to the personal name, we find it (sometimes as Nebuchadrezzar, sometimes, less correctly, as Nebuchadnezzar) in 2 K. and the parallel passages of 2 Chr., also in part or parts of Jer., Ezek., 1 Chr., Ezra, Neh., Esth., and Daniel. Now it is undeniable that (as 𝔊 also shows) the redactors understood the Babylonian king Nabû-kudur-uṣur to be referred to, and this view may be supported by the occurrence of other names such as Nebuzaradan, Nebushazban, Nergalsarezer (Jer. xxxix. 13), which, as they stand, are Babylonian. On the other hand, there are some of the foreign personal names in the story of the captivity which one might expect to be, but certainly are not, Babylonian,[1] while Nebuzaradan himself (2 K. xxv. 8, Jer. xxxix. 9, etc.) holds a distinctively N. Arabian office.[2] And it must be remembered (1) that the text in both its forms shows traces of much manipulation, and (2) that the redactors would have been perfectly able to insert a few Babylonian names, including Nebuchadrezzar,[3] if their theory required it.

2. As to the geographical name Bābel, it is not denied that it must sometimes (*e.g.* in Ezra) mean the world-famous Babylon. On the other hand, it must often, like Kūsh and Miṣrim, have a second meaning, *i.e.* be the designation of one of the two chief cities of a kingdom called Asshur or Ashḥur, which claimed suzerainty over the smaller N. Arabian kingdoms. A conspectus of the textual evidence has been given elsewhere.[4] Suffice it here to point out that there are a number of passages, chiefly in the prophets, where a methodical criticism hardly leaves much room for doubting the above statement. Thus, in Zech. ii. 10 *f.* 'Bābel' (omit *bath* as a dittograph) and 'the land of Ṣaphon' (*i.e.* Ṣibe'on = Ishmael), in Jer. l. (1) 8 'Bābel'

[1] One of these is Ashpenaz (Dan. i. 3), which, according to analogy, must come from Asshur-Ṣibe'on, a compound N. Arabian name. Other foreign non-Babylonian names are Sarsekim, Rab-saris, Rab-mag (Jer. xxxix. 3), of which the first is probably from שר־סכים (cp. סכיים, 2 Chr. xii. 3), where סכים has the same origin as סכות (*T. and B.* p. 406); the second comes from ערב־אשור (cp. סיסרא), and the third from ערב־נמר.

[2] See *T. and B.* pp. 443 *f.*

[3] 'Nebuchadrezzar' has been interpolated once or twice in Jeremiah (xxv. 9, and probably xxix. 21).

[4] *T. and B.* p. 187.

and 'the land of Ḥashram' (see p. 63), and in li. 41 'Ashḥur' (underlying משך) and 'Bābel' are parallel, while in li. 1 'Bābel of Yarḥam' (MT., בלב קמי) is a gloss on 'Bābel.' The parallelisms in Isa. xlvii. 1 ('Bābel' and 'Ḥashram'), Ps. cxxxvii. 7 *f.* ('Edom,' or rather 'Aram,'[1] and 'Bābel'), also deserve examination. Nor ought we to pass over 2 Chr. xxxiii. 11, where Asshurite captains take Manasseh and carry him to Bābel,[2] which is evidently in the kingdom of Asshur, and 2 K. xvii. 30, where the worshippers of Sukkoth-Benoth are most probably not Babylonians.

A side-question here arises. We sometimes meet with kings of Babel who seem to be distinguished from kings of Asshur; so *e.g.* in 2 K. xxiv., Jer. l. 17 *f.*, 2 K. xx. 12 (Isa. xxxix. 1). Must Bābel there mean Babylon? Yes, most probably, in 2 K. xx. 12.[3] But usually the change of title may, on the N. Arabian theory, be adequately accounted for by a change of dynasty, accompanied by a change of capital.

The facts which have been mentioned suggest two at first sight mutually exclusive theories. According to one, it was Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon who invaded Judah, and besieged and took Jerusalem. According to the other, it was some N. Arabian king, whose name, unless indeed it underlies 'Nebuchadrezzar,' has not been preserved. There is evidence for both theories. It would be hyper-criticism to deny that the great king who is known by this name (604-562 B.C.) interfered in the affairs of Judah; certainly, like every one else, I admit that he did. Still, it must also be universally admitted that the external evidence for this, though sufficient, is comparatively small. It may be that this is the result of mere accident—accident which may some day be remedied. But at any rate, as things are, Nebuchadrezzar's piety is much better recorded than the success of his campaigns. He is never tired, in the inscriptions, of dilating on his restorations of temples, and forgets to mention the cities and lands which he

[1] So Paul Haupt, *JBL* xxvi. 2, thinking of a northern Aram.
[2] We have no right to alter 'Bābel' into 'Nineveh' (so M'Curdy).
[3] Cp., however, *Crit. Bib.* p. 388.

conquered. To the historian it is piteous to be only able to refer to a fragment of an inscription relating to the things which interest him. This relic (dated by the experts 602 B.C.) refers to a campaign of Nebuchadrezzar against Ḥatti-land (*i.e.* the region to the west of the Euphrates). It needs, however, to be supplemented, and for this purpose we have to rely on Josephus's report[1] of the late but conscientious Berossus, which speaks of the rebellion of the satrap appointed by Nabopolasar in Egypt and the region of Cœle-Syria and Phœnicia, of his defeat by Nabuchodonosor, and of the captives of the Jews, Phœnicians, Syrians, etc., made by that prince after his accession to the throne.[2] The report, however, is tantalisingly meagre. One would like, for instance, to have been told something about these Jewish captives. The sepulchral remains on the ancient site of Nippur have led Hilprecht[3] to the conclusion that a large number of Jewish exiles were settled in that neighbourhood. Did Nebuchadrezzar bring them thither? Or was it only after the Captivity that they settled there?

On the other hand, the O.T. witnesses to a N. Arabian invasion and captivity. Some of the passages quoted above respecting Bābel may be referred to again here. For instance, in Zech. ii. 10 *f.* we read, 'Ho, ho! flee ye from the land of Ṣaphon, saith Yahweh. . . . Make thy escape to Zion, thou company that dwellest in Bābel.' So in Jer. i. 14, vi. 1, 22, x. 22, xxv. 9, it is Ṣaphon (*i.e.* Ishmael in a wide sense) from which the invader comes (see p. 42), and according to Jer. iii. 18, xvi. 15, it is Ṣaphon where the companies of captives will be placed. In this connexion, too, I may certainly mention Ezek. xxxviii.-xxxix., which are full of reminiscences of Jer. iv.-vi.,[4] and, not less plainly than Jer. iv.-vi., refer to a N. Arabian invasion, though not to the same one as Jeremiah, the context being

[1] *Against Apion*, i. 19.

[2] Cp. Winckler, *Keilinschr. Textbuch*(2), p. 58, n. 3.

[3] *Palestine Fund Statement*, 1898, p. 55.

[4] Cornill, *Jeremia*, p. 85, thinks that Ezek. regards Jer. iv.-vi. as an unfulfilled prophecy. But Ezek. xxxviii. 17, xxxix. 8 do not prove this. Ezekiel probably believed that great prophecies had more than one fulfilment. Certainly he held that the king of Bābel of his own time was a Ṣephonite (Ezek. xxvi. 7).

evidently eschatological. And it may fitly be added that in Jer. xxxix. 3 the princes, or high officers of the king of Bābel, do the very thing at Jerusalem which the prophet has foretold (Jer. i. 15) will be done there by 'the families of the kingdoms of Ṣaphon.' We cannot, therefore, be sure that 'king of Bābel' in 2 K. xxiv. 1 means 'king of Babylon,' or that 'the king of Bābel brought them captive to Bābel' (2 K. xxiv. 16) makes the prevalent theory secure. As we have seen, there was a southern as well as a northern Bābel.

I must not try the reader's patience too far, but there is still some supplementary evidence to be mentioned. Professor Bernhard Duhm ridicules the idea that a king of Babylon should trouble himself about a Hebrew prophet. Now I do not assert that the anecdote told in Jer. xxxix. 11 *f.* is historical, but it should be clear that the narrator is no scribbler of absurdities. Suppose that it is the king of the N. Arabian Bābel who is referred to; he, at any rate, would be likely to trouble himself about a Hebrew prophet.[1] Another much misunderstood story may also be mentioned. As the text of Jer. xxix. 22 *f.* stands, the king of Bābel 'roasted in the fire' two Hebrew prophets, because they had committed adultery and spoken false prophecies. It would be easier to believe that he *killed* them (cp. *v.* 21) because they had expressed patriotic anticipations. In fact, a keen textual criticism bids us correct קלם באש into קְטָלָם בְּאַשּׁוּר, 'whom he killed in Asshur'[2] (cp. 2 Chr. xxxiii. 11). These two captives, among others, were certainly settled in the N. Arabian Asshur, and 'Nebuchadrezzar' in *v.* 21 is an interpolation.

I reserve the most important passage for the end. In a singularly striking passage (Ezek. xxi. 24 *ff.*) Ezekiel describes how the king of Bābel set forth on his expedition. He had to choose one of two roads, both of which, we are

[1] This remark illustrates a saying of Rab-shakeh (2 K. xviii. 25), the Neko-narrative in 2 Chr. xxxv. 21, and the story of Jonah. When that prophet entered the city of Yewānah (corrupted into Nineveh, see p. 41), the king of Yewānah arose from his throne and put on sackcloth (Jon. iii. 6).

[2] אשר was probably written short as אש. In compound proper names the popular speech constantly made this shortening, *e.g.* אשחור, אשכנז, אשרור.

told, came מֵאֶרֶץ אֶחָד. What does this mean? The rendering 'from one land' is impossible, but the obvious rendering, 'from the land of one,' is absurd. How shall we escape from the dilemma? There is no possible escape (see the commentaries). It has been shown,[1] however, that אחד and אחר are repeatedly miswritten for, or corrupted in popular speech from, אשחר, somewhat as אשר (Ezra ii. 16, 42) from אשתר, and עטרות (Josh. xvi. 2, etc.) from אשתרות. Clearly the right reading is 'from the land of Ashḥur.' Not only is it in itself natural, but it is also consistent with many other equally necessary corrections of passages which have baffled earlier critics. Thus, the prophetic writer assures us that the king of Bābel who destroyed Jerusalem started from the land of Ashḥur.

Are we, then, driven to make our choice between two mutually exclusive theories? No. There is, happily, a third choice open to us, viz., so to reconcile the theories as to do justice to the facts which underlie both views. If there was a confusion between the Egyptian king Nikû who marched victoriously to Phœnicia and a king of the N. Arabian Muṣri who defeated Josiah in the far south, why should there not have been a similar confusion between Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon and a king of the Bābel in N. Arabia? In the former case we have been able to determine the facts belonging to each king. In the latter we are less fortunate, for it is impossible to distribute the traditional facts of the conquest of Jerusalem between the two potentates, greater and smaller, both of whom intervened in the affairs of Judah. I hardly like even to make the conjecture that there was an understanding between the kings, so that what Nebuchadrezzar began the N. Arabian king finished. Nor is it safe to decide whether the name 'Nebuchadrezzar' has, or has not, grown out of some N. Arabian royal name[2] (see p. 58). There are some problems which are incapable of solution. All that I need add is that in a Special Note the reference made above to the confusion of the kings of the northern and the southern Bābel is supplemented by parallels elsewhere in the historical narratives.

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 329, 505; and cp. on Dt. vi. 4.
[2] Cp. *Crit. Bib.* p. 395.

Let us return to the narrative in 2 K. The passage already quoted (2 K. xxiv. 1) comes most probably from the royal annals. Its brevity and baldness are unfortunate. Nebuchadrezzar, we are told, 'came up,' *i.e.* made a sort of demonstration in force, upon which Jehoiakim 'became his servant,' *i.e.* took the oath of fealty. We naturally ask for the date of this important event, but no answer is forthcoming. It is added, however, that three years after Jehoiakim rebelled. What can have emboldened the king to do this? Did he rely on his fortresses (see p. 50), especially on Jerusalem? Did he confide in the promises of his former suzerain, the king of Miṣrim? From another source (*v.* 2) we learn that bands of Kasdim (?), Aram,[1] Moab, and benê Ammon made incursions into Judah to 'destroy' it. If (in spite of Jer. xxvii. 3) this is correct, the neighbouring peoples were more malignant than the king of Bābel himself, who only required Jehoiakim to be loyal. But may we not suppose that the commission of these 'bands' has been misapprehended, and that it was really a licence to plunder what they could, and especially the temple of Jerusalem, for the benefit of Bābel, and then to seize and carry off Jehoiakim as a captive to Bābel? That most of this was somehow achieved, is expressly stated in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 6 and Dan. i. 2, though the conqueror mentioned there is Nebuchadrezzar king of Bābel, and in the latter passage (the source of which is unknown) the royal temple is said to have been in the land of Shinar,[2] *i.e.* Ishmael-Arabia. True, it is only the Chronicler who states this, but may he not have had some ground for this?[3] Whether the mention of the king of Bābel as present with the army is correct, may be left open. We may, of course, assume that, after some punishment, Jehoiakim (unlike his son and successor) was restored to his country.

But we must not linger on such conjectures. There are great textual difficulties which have to be considered. First of all, we must seek for a meaning for כשדים which will accord better with the Hebrew narratives and prophecies than the familiar one—'the Chaldæans,' *i.e.* the people

[1] Grätz and Benz. would read 'Edom.'

[2] *T. and B.* pp. 185 *f.*

[3] So Benzinger.

called Kaldu, whose seats were to the south-east of Babylonia. Hugo Winckler [1] hazards the theory that the Kasdim of 2 K. xxiv. 2 are different from those of 2 K. xxv., and are really the Bedouins in the far south of Judah. But we must surely take a much broader view of our problem, and seek the aid of a keener textual criticism. Such a criticism, based on experience of the habits of the scribes and of recurrent types of corruption, seems to show that the word כשדים is miswritten, that the original error was repeated again and again through the levelling process of redaction, and that the true reading is כִּשְׂרִם [2] (a regional name), or, where the name of a people is required, כשרמ׳ (= כשרמים). A more correct form would doubtless be חשרם, since the name consists of abbreviated forms of אשחר and ארם. In Dan. ii. 2 we find a list of terms for the wise men of Bābel, beginning with חרטמים and ending with כשדים, and it is suggested elsewhere [3] that the former word may have come from חשרמים, the plural of חשרם, which I have just now proposed as the most probable origin of כשדים, so that *ḥashramim*, in Dan. ii. 2, will be an explanatory gloss on *kasdim*. The people of Ashḥur (= Ezraḥ) and Aram were, in fact, proverbial, not only for their courage, but for their wisdom.[4]

It was, however, the courage, the fierceness, the elemental force of this people which just now impressed the inhabitants of Judah. The prophets of the time must have had frequent occasion to refer to them. One of these was Habakkuk, who, undismayed, reports this as a divine revelation [5] (Hab. ii. 4)—

> Lo! he is swallowed up—and cannot save his soul;
> But the righteous liveth on by his faithfulness.

The enemy, then, according to this oracle, will be suddenly

[1] *AOF* xii. 250 *ff.* So, too, Gunkel, on Gen. xxii. 22.

[2] *T. and B.* pp. 214, 332.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 460 *f.*

[4] Cp. 1 K. v. 10 *f.* [iv. 30 *f.*], where note that 'Ezraḥite' is = 'Ashḥurite,' and see *T. and B.* 40.

[5] Cheyne on the criticism of Habakkuk, *Jewish Quart. Review*, Oct. 1907, where Duhm, Marti, and Budde are considered, and an attempt is made to go forward.

overthrown. It is the enemy whose name is Ḥashram. So, at least, Habakkuk interprets the supernormal experience which he has had. Was the vision entered in the Book of Destiny, or, as later writers would have said, in the heavenly tablets? No; the seer spoke an unfulfilled prophecy. Yet he was a true 'man of God,' though, conscientiously, a speaker of smooth words for Israel. Little that is certainly his may have come down to us, but that little is full of faith and moral earnestness. It is to be found in i. 5-10, 14-17, ii. 1-4, and almost at the beginning we are confronted with the Ḥashramim (Kasdim), *i.e.* the men of Ashḥur-Aram. Now it cannot be doubted that the prophet's idea of this people is definite enough (see *v.* 6), and yet we cannot fail to notice that *v.* 5 is rhetorically expressed. In fact, the warriors of Ashḥur or Asshur had been seen in Palestine often enough for a conventional form of description of them to have sprung up. Still more essential is it to recognise that the people which Yahweh is about to 'stir up' (*v.* 6) is a N. Arabian people, not one of the nearer populations, but a comparatively distant one (Isa. v. 26, Jer. vi. 22), and a people whose language is, even if our scholars would call it akin to Hebrew, yet for practical purposes so unlike it as to be unintelligible to the Judaites (Jer. v. 15, Isa. xxxiii. 19)—an additional cause of terror. See Note on the Kasdim of Habakkuk.

No wonder, then, that the country-folk were seized with terror, and fled to the nearest fortified towns. It may help us in realising this to refer to a little poem, referring surely to an earlier N. Arabian invasion (Isa. x. 27 end-32), which tells how the people of the small towns fled before the foe. Jeremiah, too, in prophetic imagination, summons the Judaite inhabitants of the south border-land to take refuge in the fortified cities, especially in Zion or Jerusalem[1] (Jer. iv. 5 *f.*, vi. 1). This race for safety may be illustrated by the story of the Rekabites (Jer. xxxv.). We need not,

[1] On Jer. iv. 5 *f.*, vi. 1, see *Crit. Bib.* pp. 53-55. As Duhm points out, it would be absurd to call on Jerusalemites to flee to Zion. It is also extremely strange to summon only Benjamites to flee before the foe, and to summon them to flee, not to, but from Jerusalem. And if people are to flee from Jerusalem, what is the good of blowing the trumpet in Tekoa? The remedy is to read יחז׳ for יהודה, בני יסין for

of course, accept all the details. It is incredible that Jeremiah should have tempted these simple folk to break their law by drinking wine. But there seems to be a foundation of fact. The statement that the Rekabites adhered to the rules of their reputed ancestor is in itself probable.[1] Jeremiah, too, may have made an instructive comparison between this tribe or clan and the people of Judah.[2] That the Rekabites fled from the invaders is also probable enough, for 1 Chr. ii. 55,[3] rightly (as I hope) explained, shows that they dwelt in the south border-land. Tradition further states (Judg. i. 16) that the Kenites, to whom the Rekabites belonged, dwelt in the most southern part of Judah. We can therefore well understand how the members of the clan should have fled with the Judaites of the border to Jerusalem 'because of the army of Ḥashram and because of the army of Aram'[4] (*v.* 11).

It is not certain to which invasion of Judah this story of the Rekabites refers. Probably, however, it was the second (2 K. xxiv. 2; see p. 62). The first invasion—that mentioned in 2 K. xxiv. 1—was hardly terrifying enough, if, as I have suggested, it was really a 'demonstration,' a sort of object-lesson to Jehoiakim. But the second invasion (if invasion it was) does appear to supply an adequate cause for the flight of the Rekabites.

בני בנימין, and ישמעאל for ירושלם (see p. 24). The 'sons of Yamin (= Yaman)' are the Israelite or Judaite inhabitants of part of the N. Arabian border-land so often called 'Yeraḥme'el' and 'Ishmael,' among whom, as we have seen, was probably Huldah the prophetess. Tekoa and Beth-Hakkerem are both places in that district. See Introduction on Beth-Hakkerem, and *E. Bib.*, 'Tekoa.'

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Rechabites.'

[2] The Rekabites had a pure form of Yahweh-worship (cp. 2 K. x.) See *E. Bib.*, 'Rechabites.'

[3] יעבץ (A.V., Jabez) is corrupt; it may have come from צבעון (= Ishmael). חמת is probably an abbreviation of רחמת (cp. רחם = ירחם, *v.* 44). ספרים means, not 'scribes,' but 'men of ספר (or, ספרת)'; 'Sophereth' is the name of a place in Ishmaelite Arabia (Neh. vii. 57; see *E. Bib.*, 'Solomon's Servants'). Meyer's theory (*Entst. des Judenthums*, p. 318), that Neh. ii. 55 indicates that the Calibbites of Jabez were specially zealous proselytes, is wide of the mark.

[4] Note that 𝔊 gives, not 'Aram,' but 'the Assyrians,' *i.e.* (in the original Hebrew) the Asshurites of N. Arabia. This, too, would probably be an archaism.

Jehoiakim looks on while the people is being loosed from its moorings. Jeremiah warns him that ruin is impending (Jer. xiii. 18-21), but in vain. No help from Misrim appears; the king 'came no more out of his land' (2 K. xxiv. 7).[1] Soon the tramp of the invaders is heard, but just then the energetic but unwise king passed away. The Chronicler (2 Chr. xxxvi. 8) has preserved the tradition that he was buried, like Manasseh and Amon (2 K. xxi. 18, 26), not in the city of David, but in the garden of Uzza.[2] He was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin. It was hard for the young prince, who was only eighteen. Did he trust in Ashtart, or had king and people given up hoping in her when the foreign warriors set foot on the soil of Judah? The author of the 'epitome' is as much prejudiced against Jehoiachin as Berossus is against Evil-Merodach, who reigned (as he asserts) 'lawlessly and impiously.' Jeremiah, however, finds no more fault with Jehoiachin than with Jehoahaz. His fate, indeed, is irreversible, but it is implied that neither Hezekiah nor Josiah would have fared better.

As I live, saith Yahweh, | though Coniah[3] were (in very deed)
The signet on my right hand, | I would pluck him thence.[4]

In another little poem, written just after Jehoiachin's enforced departure, Jeremiah utters the passionate cry—

Is Coniah a despised work? | is he a vessel of no value?
Why is he tossed and thrown | to the land of Asshur?[5]

He feels the hardness of the destiny. The heir of David is tossed away like the meanest potter's vessel, and the spot on which he lights is the land of Asshur.

[1] *V.* 7 would stand more naturally after *v.* 1.

[2] 𝔊$^{\text{II}}$ has ἐν γανοζαη; Luc. ἐν γαν Οζα. The tradition was probably omitted from 2 Kings because of Jeremiah's prediction (Jer. xxii. 18 *f.*).

[3] More strictly Konyahu (Jer. xxxvii. 1). Elsewhere in Jer., Yekonyahu.

[4] Jer. xxii. 24. *Vv.* 25-27 belong to the supplementer. Read 'him' for 'thee.'

[5] The text has been much worked over. 𝔊 helps us somewhat; also experience gained elsewhere.

The note of passion is wanting in Ezekiel, which is strange, since he shared Jehoiachin's captivity. A great eagle is said to have come to Lebanon (Ezek. xvii. 3 *f.*), to have cropped off the topmost of the sprouts of the cedar, and brought it to the land of Canaan, *i.e.*, as the parallel clause explains, 'set it in Arabia of Yeraḥme'el' (see special note, p. 94). The eagle is the king of Bābel; Lebanon, the Davidic family. 'Canaan' is obviously not Palestine, but may, or rather must, be some N. Arabian region;[1] in Ezek. xvi. 29 it is identified with כשדים, under which name lies, in a shortened form, 'Ashḥur-Aram' (see p. 63). Ezekiel, then, like Jeremiah, implies, both here and elsewhere, that Jehoiachin was taken captive by the chief potentate of N. Arabia, who, in the prophet's brief explanation of the parable (*v.* 12), is called 'the king of Bābel.' That this royal warrior started on his campaigns from Ashḥur or Asshur, we have learned already (p. 61) from Ezek. xxi. 24. Apparently, therefore, he was not Nebuchadrezzar.

Three months (the Chronicler adds ten days) was all the time that the young king had to reign. In this he resembled Jehoahaz, but, unlike that king, he did not wait to be deposed. Before the siege was far advanced, he went out with the queen-mother and his wives (children are not mentioned), attended by the princes and courtiers, and surrendered. Seven thousand men of the propertied class, as well as one thousand craftsmen and smiths,[2] went with the king. Some of the prophets may also have been taken, though many remained, for Ezekiel can hardly have been alone. The treasuries of the temple and of the palace were also rifled (see 2 K. xxiv. 10-16, Jer. xxvii. 19-22, xxviii. 3, 6).

From his captor's point of view, it was in favour of Jehoiachin that he had not, like his father, broken an oath of fealty. Hence, perhaps, the favour into which he was taken by the great king thirty-seven years after (2 K. xxiv. 27, Jer. lii. 24-34). He was released from prison,

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 85, 175, 475.

[2] See Jer. xxiv. 1, xxix. 2. A thoroughly Eastern measure. Cp. 1 S. xiii. 19 *f.*, where read, 'and they brought down all the artisans of Israel to the land of the Philistines.'

pensioned, and admitted among the king's table-guests. No king among those who entered the presence had so high a seat as he who once ruled for three months in Jerusalem. Is this historical? we ask. The evidence is scanty, but we cannot hastily reject it. Only we have to make sure that we understand it. For the words of the statement mean more than appears on the surface. They imply the recognition of the Jews as a people, with its own cultus and with internal independence, under the headship of Jehoiachin.[1] Further, the royal rights of Jehoiachin would be transmitted to his son. In 1 Chr. iii. 17 *f.* no less than seven sons are named; one of these, clearly, would inherit a claim to the throne.

The story is important on two grounds. 1. It shows how thoroughly developed was the belief in the Babylonian captivity as the only one in the time of the redactor of Kings. For the name of the king of Bābel who befriended Jehoiachin is given as Evil-Merodach. Evidently this is a modification of Amil-Marduk, the name of the son and successor of Nebuchadrezzar (562-560 B.C.). With much ingenuity Winckler[2] seeks to show that Amil-Marduk favoured a different party from his father—the so-called hierarchic party, which was everywhere disposed to sanction the repair of temples. More than this the story cannot show, for if 'Nebuchadrezzar' is an interpolation, so also, of course, is 'Evil-Merodach.'

2. It has also been thought, somewhat too optimistically, to contribute to the solution of historical problems. As we have seen, the Chronicler gives a list (1 Chr. iii. 17 *f.*) of the sons of Jeconiah or Jehoiachin, any one of whom would be capable of inheriting the crown. In fact, one of the seven, Shenaṣṣar, has been identified with Sheshbaṣṣar (a governor of Judah under the Persian king), while a grandson of Jeconiah in *v.* 19 bears the name Zerubbabel (a still better known governor of Judah). It is true, all these names, Shenaṣṣar, Sheshbaṣṣar, Zerubbabel, are supposed

[1] Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judenthums*, pp. 78 *f.*; Winckler, *AOF* xi. 204; *KAT*(3), p. 284.

[2] *AOF* xi. 198; cp. *KAT*(3), pp. 110, 284. Berossus may have used an old source, influenced by the anti-hierarchic party.

to be of Babylonian origin. The view is plausible, but the proof of it is not as complete as we require. Indeed, it is quite possible that any Babylonian appearance that these names may present may be due to redactors. Nor can one think it likely that a Babylonian name should occur in the middle of a list of seven names[1] which, apart from this one disputed name, are distinctly S. Canaanitish or N. Arabian. May not שנאצר really represent שמנאצר, since שנ (as in שנאב) comes from ישמן = ישמעאל, and אצר is an Edomite name, attested in Gen. xxxvi. 21?[2] I fear, therefore, that the expectation referred to has not yet been realised.

[1] As the text stands, there are eight names, but the first, אֲשֻׁר, is probably the first part of the compound name rightly read as Asshur-Eshtaol (*T. and B.* p. 540; cp. p. 70, n. 3).

[2] *T. and B.* p. 426.

CHAPTER VII

ZEDEKIAH—MORALITY AND RELIGION—EZEK. VIII.

THOUGH much was lost, there were still a fatherland and a temple. Israel, it might be hoped, had learned its lesson. Its new king (provided by the conqueror) was unambitious, and may have seemed a safe ruler. He was a still-surviving son of Josiah,[1] called Mattaniah, a name which, on his elevation to the throne, the suzerain changed to Zedekiah[2] (properly Ṣidḳiyyāhū). The story of his reign is drawn largely from the Book of Jeremiah, supplemented by that of Ezekiel. Let us first borrow something from the latter (Ezek. xvii. 5-21). The allegorist represents the new king as a humble vine-plant, trailing on the ground. It was planted by the great eagle known to us already (p. 67), who imposed upon it one obligation—that its branches should turn to him, and its roots be subject to him. Then, we are told, came another great eagle, and behold the vine bent its roots and stretched its branches no longer to the first, but to the second eagle. The consequences of this could be foreseen: by the most trifling effort it could be uprooted (*v.* 9). The historical explanation follows (*vv.* 12-21). The king of Bābel came to Jerusalem, and removed its king, in whose place he set up a royal prince as king, entering into a covenant with him. It was but a modest realm, but if the king had kept his covenant he might have continued. But quite otherwise did he act. 'He rebelled against him, in sending his envoys to Miṣrim, that it might give him

[1] His mother's name was Ḥamuṭal (see 45).

[2] Ṣidḳia was the name of a king of Ashkelon in Hezekiah's time.

horses[1] and a large force' (*v.* 15; see on Dt. xvii. 16). Here the retrospect ceases, and the prospect of calamity begins.[2] Yahweh is the God of covenants in general; he notes the broken covenant between the foreign king and Zedekiah (cp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 13*a*), and will provide for just retribution. The agent may seem to be the king of Bābel, but is really Yahweh (*vv.* 19 *f.*).

There is also another allegory in which Zedekiah is referred to (Ezek. xix. 5-9). This time the description is idealistic. One might imagine that Jehoiakim (the true Jehoiakim) was intended, for the language points to a lover of war and even to a conqueror. Nothing could here be said of Zedekiah's faithlessness, and the description of his final misfortunes passes over the climax of them all—the blinding. For a mention of this we must go to Ezek. xii. 13; 'yet shall he not see it,' says the prophet, 'though he shall die there.' Certainly Ezekiel judges the hapless Zedekiah by a singularly strict moral standard.

The historian, however, must not follow Ezekiel in his severity, for Zedekiah could hardly call his soul his own; the real power belonged to the upstart princes. Not that the princes were alone responsible for the moral downfall of the state. 'Every head is sick, and every heart faint.' Ezekiel (chap. xv.) compares Jerusalem to the worthless wood of the wild vine. Of a piece of such wood the fire has consumed both ends, and it has now attacked the middle. The 'two ends' are the two kingdoms; the 'middle' is Jerusalem. Ezekiel admits, however (xiv. 22 *f.*), that the exiled portion of the community is not so deeply corrupt as the actual Jerusalem; Jeremiah, too, draws the same distinction. Who does not remember the vision (Jer. xxiv.) of the two baskets of figs, one containing very good figs, like those that are first ripe, the other very bad figs which could not be eaten (cp. Jer. xxix. 17)? The former denote Jehoiachin and his fellow-exiles, whom Yahweh will bring back to their land; the latter are those left under Zedekiah, or those who have fled to the land of Miṣrim, for both of whom a dreadful fate is reserved.

[1] On horses in N. Arabia see *T. and B.* p. 462.

[2] On *v.* 17 see Kraetzschmar. פרעה is an incorrect gloss.

It may be that both prophets somewhat failed to comprehend the situation. With their own feet planted upon a rock they could not realise the state of those who were storm-tossed and without a compass. The gulf between these prophets and the average citizens was immense. Jeremiah and Ezekiel might have been the compass of the storm-tossed, but there was one precious gift which had been denied them —that of persuasiveness. Still there must have been some who listened more attentively than others to the great prophets, and these would naturally be found in the more cultured class. We can well understand that the removal of this class to Bābel would produce injurious effects on the residuum. How could *parvenus* lordlings, who had made their fortunes by driving hard bargains with the emigrating exiles, help being puffed up with vanity?[1] And how could wise counsel proceed from their collective statesmanship?

As for religion, it could hardly have fallen very much lower, considering the depth which it had reached under Jehoiakim. Nor would it perceptibly have affected the religious standard if the lower cults had received a mere formal discouragement. Was such a discouragement actually given? In favour of this view it might be urged that prophets of Yahweh were consulted both in Jerusalem and in the land of exile. Zedekiah himself laid great store by Jeremiah (Jer. xxxvii. 3, 17, xxxviii. 14 *ff.*). It might also be held that at the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem king and people gave a singular proof of regard for Yahwistic moral principles (Jer. xxxiv.). It is well known that both in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxi. 2) and in Deuteronomy (xv. 12) there is a law that a Hebrew slave should be set free after six years of service. This law had been neglected; now, however, it was carried out with a peculiarly solemn covenant (*v.* 19). Moreover, we learn from Jer. xliv. 17 *f.* that the cult of the Queen of Heaven[2] had lately been abandoned. Such appears to be all the evidence that exists for a revival of Yahwism. It is not much in quantity, and the supposed recognition of Yahwistic morality will not bear

[1] Ezekiel's description of the princes (xxii. 27) corresponds to the prevalent tendency of the ruling class at all times (cp. Isa. i. 23).

[2] Or 'of Ishmael'; see *T. and B.* p. 18. Ashtart is intended.

examination.[1] Still it is probable that as the political prospect became darker a tendency arose towards a greater regard for the cult of Yahweh.

The tendency cannot, however, have been a strong one. There is abundant evidence for the continuance of the cults in vogue before Zedekiah, and the writer of 2 K. xxiv. 19 asserts that from a Yahwistic point of view that king was no better than Jehoiakim. Ezekiel (xiv. 5) distinctly says that the house of Israel 'have estranged themselves from Yahweh with all their idols.' We know, too, from Ezek. viii. 12 that (about 592 B.C.) the cult of Yahweh was rejected by elders of the people, on the ground that Yahweh did not see them and had forsaken the land. The chapter to which this passage belongs is full to overflowing of evidence for Jerusalem's heathenism. The lower cults there described are those which competed successfully with the strict worship of Yahweh. The description, however, is not easy to interpret.

It will not be a superfluous digression if we confront the difficulties. Unless we do so, we shall be unable to estimate aright the religious and political currents of the time. And the question which we have to keep before us, and which our study of Ezek. viii. will enable us to answer, is this—Were the popular cults in Zedekiah's time of Babylonian, or of Canaanite and N. Arabian origin?[2]

Certainly, it would be agreeable to suppose that some of those cults were of direct Babylonian origin. The supposition would be in harmony with the view here adopted that Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon played a great *rôle* in the later affairs of Judah, though not so as to exclude a N. Arabian invasion about the same time. If there was just now a double danger to the state, one would expect to find that some of the popular cults of the day came from N. Arabia and some from Babylon. But which of them can we, with a safe historical conscience, trace to Babylon? Let us turn to Ezek. viii. and examine the details as briefly

[1] We are told (*v.* 11) that 'afterwards,' *i.e.* after the siege had been raised (xxxvii. 5), 'all the princes and all the people' (surely an exaggeration) cancelled their engagements.

[2] See 'Ezekiel's Visions of Jerusalem,' *Expositor*, May 1908.

but as penetratingly as limits of space permit. In *v.* 3 we read that a spirit, or divine energy, lifted Ezekiel up, and brought him 'in visions of God' to Jerusalem, to the door of the north gateway of the inner court of the temple, 'where was the place of the image of Ḳin'ah [ham]makneh.' Ezekiel means that he was brought to the very same place where formerly (under Manasseh) the image referred to had stood. In a subsequent passage (*v.* 5) he says in effect that when his attention was free, he observed that the same image (removed by Josiah, and not yet set up again when the prophet left Jerusalem as an exile) had been erected once more, though in a different place.[1] Now, we have no right to ask, 'What's in a name,' and leave the image without any but the impossible name 'Jealousy,' supplemented by 'that awakens jealousy' (against which philology has much to urge). Nor may we, with Gunkel, emend 'the image of Jealousy' into 'the image of the reeds,' and interpret this of the dragon Tiamat (Ps. lxviii. 31, 'the beast of the reeds'?).[2] Undoubtedly the goddess referred to is Asherah. Several scholars of note have already seen this. What they have not seen is the right form, and therefore meaning, of the name. The right form throws fresh light on the N. Arabian affinities of the late Judaite religion.[3]

It is equally hard to trace the superstitions referred to in *v.* 10. Here we read, 'And I entered, and looked; and, behold, every form of reptiles and (other) beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, graven upon the wall round about.' The explanations of W. R. Smith, Toy, and Gunkel are hardly satisfactory. Neither clan-totems nor Babylonian dragons[4] ('helpers of Rahab,' Job ix. 13) can justifiably be found here, especially as neither theory is consistent with the words, 'and all the idols of the house of Israel,' which intervene between 'abomination' and 'graven.' It is only an

[1] The prophet's words are, 'and I lifted up mine eyes northward, and, behold, north of the gate of the altar (?) was that image of Ḳin'ah at the entrance (?).' On *vv.* 3, 5, see Kraetzschmar.

[2] *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895), p. 141.

[3] קנאה probably comes from אנקיה, and אנק, like ענק and אבן, may come from some shortened form of ירחמאל (the final ל often becomes נ). מקנה may come from רקמניה; cp. רקם = ירחם. See *T. and B.* pp. 18 *f.*, 121.

[4] So Gunkel.

enlarged experience of similarly corrupt passages elsewhere, and of the habits of the scribes, which can help us much here. For my own part, I have—since 1903—been satisfied with this suggestion,—that here and in Ezek. xviii. 6 (as well as in some other O.T. passages) ישראל has been mis-written for ישמעאל. As for רמש ובהמה, that I take to be a gloss consisting of two regional names, and defining, for ancient readers, the geographical meaning of ישמעאל in this passage.[1] As the most probable original form of the text of *v.* 10 one may propose, 'every form of abominations (= images), namely, all the idols of the house of Ishmael, graven in the wall round about.' N. Arabian again.

A Babylonian origin is more plausibly supposed for the strange scene described in *v.* 14, 'and he brought me to the door of the north gateway, and behold, there were the women, weeping for the Tammuz.' One thinks involuntarily of the ritual mourning of the Babylonians for the disappearance of the god of vernal vegetation, one form of whose name was Tamūz.[2] Still I doubt very much whether the ritual mourning for the dead god first arose in Canaan so late,[3] and if (as I suppose) it was of much earlier date, the name of the god would hardly have been Tamūz.[4] For light on the passage we must have recourse to Jer. vii. 18, xliv. 17 *ff.*; it is surely at the sacred meal that the women are sitting, and they are engaged in ritual benedictions (read מברכות) of Ashtart, one of whose many titles was a name which may at last have become corrupted into מולית[5] or מוית (תמוז, Tamūz). The true name is ישמעאלית.

I have not yet done with the prophet Ezekiel, nor sufficiently answered the question, Did Babylon, in this troublous time, exercise a religious influence on Jerusalem? In the very next chapter (ix.) we find a terrible imaginative account of the massacre of the wicked inhabitants of

1 רמש probably comes from רמשח, and בהמה from ערב־חמת. In explanation, see *T. and B.* pp. 249, 571.

2 See *E. Bib.*, 'Tammuz.'

3 *T. and B.* pp. 56, 326 *f.*

4 Isa. xvii. 10 suggests the name 'Na'aman,' on the origin of which see *T. and B.* p. 56, n. 2. Hadad and Rimmon (Ra'aman) would also be possible. See *T. and B.* pp. 36, 326, 438 *f.*

5 *T. and Bib.* p. 19, notes 3 and 4.

Jerusalem by seven heavenly beings in human form. One of the seven (not directly engaged in the massacre) is clothed in linen,[1] and has a writer's inkhorn at his side (*v.* 2). According to Gunkel and Zimmern,[2] this is a Hebraised form of Nabû, the Babylonian writer-god, by whom the destinies of men were written down on the heavenly tablets, and who was also one of the seven planetary deities. Certainly the parallelism is too obvious to be disregarded. But we must not forget two other important parallelisms with Ex. xii. 23 and Dan. x. 5 respectively. In the former passage (cp. 2 S. xxiv. 16) 'the destroyer' is clearly the warlike Mal'ak or Mal'ak Yahweh (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el);[3] in the latter (as a Talmudic interpretation also represents) the man clothed in linen is Gabriel, who is but a pale copy of Mika'el[4] (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el). The affinity of many points in the Babylonian and other W. Asiatic religions is beyond doubt, and fresh importations from Babylon may have been made quite late. But why should we suppose that Yahweh's great Helper, the second member of the divine company (*i.e.* Yeraḥme'el), was provided with fresh Babylonian characteristics, belonging properly to Nabû, in the age of Ezekiel? On the whole, then, there seems to be nothing in chaps. viii. and ix. of Ezekiel which clearly betokens recent direct influence of Babylon on the religion of Judah. The cults or religious forms which are there described are those which in earlier or later times appear to have come from N. Arabia.

At any rate, trouble impended from N. Arabia, which religious fanatics sought to avert in one way, and politicians in another. Nor can the counsellors of Zedekiah be supposed to have been alone in their plottings. From one petty realm to another the message flew, 'Confederate yourselves against Bābel.' From Edom, from Moab, from the benê Ammon, from Ṣor, from Ṣidon, envoys are said to have visited Jerusalem with this object in view (Jer. xxvii. 3). It is highly probable that all the kingdoms represented were near the S. Palestinian border, and were within the range of

[1] The linen represents the luminous appearance of the divine body.
[2] *KAT*(3), p. 404. [3] *T. and B.* pp. 277-280, 291-294.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 102 (n. 3), 293.

a N. Arabian invasion; for both here and in chap. xxv. we are compelled to admit the existence of a southern Ṣor and a southern Ṣidon.[1] What the result of the negotiations was we are not told, but we know that Jeremiah (statesman as well as prophet) did his best to prevent them from succeeding, and in the style of Isaiah (Isa. xx. 2) performed a symbolic act to convey to all beholders his stern message. 'Thus hath Yahweh said, Make thee a yoke, and put it upon thy neck' (Jer. xxvii. 2); it was a symbol of the inevitable doom of Judah; the date is the fourth year of Zedekiah (596-595 B.C.). Even the prophets of Yahweh, however, disagreed with Jeremiah. One of them, 'Hananiah the prophet'[2] (as he is emphatically called), announced in public, in the temple, that the sacred vessels which had been carried away to Bābel should be restored, and Jeconiah and his fellow-exiles brought home (Jer. xxviii. 1-4). Jeremiah could not pass over this direct contradiction, and administered a serious warning to his opponent, whom, however, it could not possibly have convinced. In fact Hananiah's next step was to treat Jeremiah as a false prophet. Was Jeremiah a symboliser? So, too, would Hananiah be, only for a different end. He took the yoke from Jeremiah's neck and broke it, exclaiming, 'Thus hath Yahweh said, So will I break the yoke of the king of Bābel from the neck of all the nations'[3] (Jer. xxviii. 11). Upon this, strangely enough, Jeremiah 'went his way.' Whether afterwards he actually said to Hananiah, 'This year shalt thou die' (*v.* 17) is a matter of doubt—not because there are no parallels outside the Bible for the fulfilment of such a special prediction, but (1) because such predictions are not in the style of the great prophets as these are portrayed in their most authentic and most characteristic sayings, (2) because the narratives in Jeremiah have evidently been retouched, and (3) because such an utterance would surely have provoked Hananiah to fierce anger.

It is from such an authentic and characteristic discourse of Ezekiel (chap. xiii.) that we derive the information that

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 72 (n. 4), 314.
[2] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Prophecy,' § 24*a*.
[3] Following the simpler text of 𝔊.

the prophets and prophetesses of Yahweh who went into exile with Jehoiachin were no wiser than those of Jerusalem. Ezekiel flatly denies that they have the spirit of Yahweh; their pleasant visions are no better than a plastered wall. He does not, indeed, dispute their belief in themselves, but asserts that they seduce the people by their 'vanities' and their 'lies,' and proclaims that they shall not return to the land of Israel. We, more dispassionate, can perhaps mitigate the censure of Ezekiel. It was possible to be a genuine prophet and yet to misinterpret the will of God. One such misinterpreting and yet true prophet was Habakkuk, who, a few years earlier, took a not less superficial view of things (p. 63 *f.*), and if we compare Hananiah's expressions in Jer. xxviii. with those in Isa. x. 25, xxix. 15,[1] we cannot say that they are altogether dissimilar.

The question of questions of course is, Did these prophets raise, or lower, the moral standard? In Jer. vi. 15 the priests and prophets are said to have 'committed abominations'; the passage, however, is admittedly not Jeremiah's,[2] and the two preceding verses only speak of covetousness and moral superficiality. More important is Jer. xxiii. 14, where adultery is specified as a common sin of the prophets. Taking this in connexion with *v.* 11, where prophet and priest are called 'profane' or 'heathenish,' and their wickedness is said to have been 'found' in Yahweh's house, we may plausibly suppose that the 'adultery' is connected with some heathenish cult in Yahweh's temple (cp. Ezek. viii.). This gives a fresh point to the statement in *v.* 14 that the prophets of Jerusalem 'strengthen the hands of evil-doers.'[3] In Jer. xxix. 23 we again find adultery and lying oracles coupled as sins of a prophet, but this passage has not escaped corruption and interpolation.[4] On the whole, we must take an unfavourable view of the average moral position of the prophets, but admit the probability that there

[1] It is true, these passages are probably post-exilic, and written for those who were in a different stage of spiritual development.

[2] See Duhm and Cornill.

[3] It is true, the same phrase is used by Ezekiel (xiii. 22) of the 'lying' prophetesses among the exiles without reference to heathenish customs.

[4] See *E. Bib.*, 'Ahab,' 2.

were some who were better, though tradition has passed over all but one of them—Habakkuk.

It is very possible that the king of Bābel took notice of the ferment among the politicians and the prophets. If Jer. xxix. in the shorter form recognised by Duhm is at all historical, Jeremiah knew of two leading prophets among the exiles[1] whom he accuses of gross immorality and of prophesying falsely, and who, he says, will be publicly slain by the king of Bābel (see p. 60). Moreover, Jer. xxix. 3 speaks of Elasah and Gemariah, and li. 59 of Seraiah, as Zedekiah's special ambassadors to Bābel.[2] These statements may well be trustworthy; they should probably be taken in combination. The king of Bābel may have been irritated by the fanatical preaching of the prophets and have made an example of two specially troublesome ones close at hand, and Seraiah (not to mention the others), besides conveying the annual tribute,[3] may have been charged to minimise the political importance of the preaching of the prophets. That Zedekiah also went is possible, but not probable. For there is no evidence that the suzerain had convoked a *durbar*. Had he done so, Zedekiah (like Ahaz and Manasseh on similar occasions)[4] would have been careful to attend.

According to Winckler,[5] the ambassadors of Zedekiah (he refers to Jer. xxix. 3) had another object, viz., to bring about the restoration of the Yahweh-cult in the temple, which, he thinks, was in abeyance throughout Zedekiah's reign, owing to the removal, not the destruction, of the sacred vessels. 'The temple, however, was still standing, and without a cult neither city nor king was possible.' Winckler supposes, therefore, that it was only the 'orthodox mono-

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Ahab,' 2.

[2] Reading, in Jer. li. 59, מֵאֵת instead of אֶת־.

[3] 𝔊, Jer. li. 59, describes Seraiah as ἄρχων δώρων (שר מנחה); similarly Targ.; and, among moderns, Grätz, Cheyne, *Pulpit Commentary on Jeremiah*, ii. (1885), S. A. Cook, *E. Bib.*, 'Seraiah,' who sees that tribute is referred to.

[4] See 2 K. xvi. 10 (for Ahaz), and the lists of kings' names in Schrader, *KAT*(2), pp. 355 *ff.* (for Manasseh). The kings were tributaries of Esar-haddon and Ashurbanipa

[5] *KAT*(3), pp. 278-280.

theistic Yahweh-cultus' which was abolished; the 'ordinary Canaanite forms of cult' ('no doubt partly identical with those of Zedekiah') were either allowed to remain or set up again. And when Jeremiah (xxvii. 17) adjures the people to submit to the king of Bābel that they may live, he means, 'give up the hope of the restoration of the temple-cult in the sense of Josiah and of orthodoxy, and be content with what is left.' 'This,' Winckler continues, 'is the precise opposite of the demands of the Yahweh-party, to which Jeremiah as a pro-Babylonian, is absolutely opposed.'

But, we must ask, why should Zedekiah have petitioned for the restoration of the Yahweh-cult when one of the chief objects of the party which favoured this petition was the restoration of Jeconiah or Jehoiachin (Jer. xxviii. 1-4)? 'And is there any trace in Jeremiah or in Ezekiel of the supposed fact that the Yahweh-cult in the temple had been violently closed, or in the records of the life of Jeremiah that this enthusiast for Yahweh was "content with what was left" after this catastrophe had occurred?'[1]

The year came, however, when no tribute-bearing caravan took the road for Bābel. The influence of Jeremiah and the more sober-minded citizens had sunk to zero. The war-party, who still trusted in a foreign king, had howled down remonstrance, and Zedekiah rebelled. Our information is painfully meagre; who was this foreign king? In Jer. xliv. 30 (MT.) we meet with the statement that the king of Miṣraim (Egypt) would equally with Zedekiah be given into the hand of his enemies. It is natural to combine this with Jer. xxxvii. 5 (MT.), which relates how, on the approach of Pharaoh's army, the Kasdim raised the siege of Jerusalem, and then to infer that the king referred to is the Egyptian king Uaḥ-ab-ra, the Apries of Herodotus (588-569 B.C.). In fact, according to that historian (ii. 161), Apries 'fought by sea with the Tyrians,' which, it has been suggested, 'only means that he sent assistance to the Tyrians in their long resistance to Nebuchadrezzar,' while the statement in the same passage, 'he led an army against Sidon,' may 'refer to the expedition planned with a view to succour Jerusalem.'[2] This view

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Zedekiah,' § 4. [2] *E. Bib.*, 'Hophra' (W. M. Müller).

appears rather precarious, though certainly, if Ne-ka-u II. had already revived the claims of Egypt to Syria and Palestine, one might plausibly suppose that Uaḥ-ab-ra would follow his example. The first point, therefore, to be decided is, whether Ne-ka-u intervened or not in the affairs of Palestine. This has been shown (pp. 35 *ff.*) to be doubtful. The next is, whether 'Hophra' in the MT. of Jer. xliv. 30 is correct. If it is true that Ne-ka-u occurs again and again in the O.T. in a slightly Hebraised form, why is Uaḥ-ab-ra, in its supposed Hebrew form, only found once? Surely there is an error in the case. The supposed name חפרע has arisen out of a dittographed פרעה[1] and פרעה is the redactor's substitute for פראו (see p. 37), so that the original text ran, 'Behold, I will give Pir'u king of Miṣrim into the hand of his enemies.'

So, then, the foreign king on whom the war-party relied, and to whom Zedekiah, like Hoshea in similar circumstances,[2] sent an embassy (Ezek. xvii. 15; see pp. 70 *f.*), was the king of the N. Arabian Miṣrim. The use of this name, as we have seen (p. 38), is archaistic, but such archaisms occur even in late books. The Miṣrites, however, did not hurry, and the king of Bābel pressed on unopposed. Strangely enough, he had been uncertain whether to march to Jerusalem or to Rabbath-Ammon. A graphic description is given by Ezekiel (xxi. 21[26] *f.*). One of two ways had to be chosen; both started from the land of Ashḥur or Asshur (see p. 61). So the pious king first shuffled the arrows before the teraphim, and then inspected the liver of a sacrificed animal.[3] The result of the divination was that the way to Jerusalem was chosen. The incidents of the march are not told us, but in Jer. xxxiv. 7 we read of the siege of Lachish and Azekah; perhaps the same course was taken as in the Asshurite invasion in Hezekiah's time (see 2 K. xviii. 17).[4] It is hardly likely that the invader paused at Tekoa and Beth-kerem, places mentioned by Jeremiah in an imaginative picture of such an invasion (Jer. vi. 1; see p. 64 n. 1). At

[1] Cp. *Crit. Bib.* p. 76. [2] See 2 K. xvii. 4; *Crit. Bib.* p. 376.

[3] See *E. Bib.* col. 5398.

[4] Probably *vv.* 13*b*-16 refer to the invasion of Sennacherib, and the rest of the composite narrative to an Asshurite invasion. Cp. p. 89.

any rate the Asshurites had not long encamped before the capital when the siege had to be raised (Jer. xxxvii. 5). The Miṣrites of N. Arabia were on the march. Something, then, the 'cracked reed' really did for the too confiding king of Judah. According to Josephus, the king of *Egypt* was defeated, and retired to his own land; Jeremiah (xxxvii. 7) at any rate prophesies that the Miṣrite army will retire.

It was at this period (p. 72) that the freed Hebrew slaves were reduced to servitude again—a proof of the hypocritical character of the new Yahwistic movement. These short-sighted people, like their ancestors under Hezekiah,[1] persuaded themselves that the Asshurite besiegers had disappeared for good, in which case there was no special need for them to pretend to be strict Yahwists.[2] It is true the persuasion cannot have been quite general. There must have been not a few who feared the Asshurites, and regretted Zedekiah's rebellion. In Jer. xxxviii. 19, lii. 15, we read of a class of persons called 'those who have fallen away to the Kasdim.' But there would be others who quite agreed with the 'fallers away,' though circumstances prevented them from leaving the city. These must have lived in fear and trembling, and it was not unnatural that Jeremiah should incur the suspicion expressed thus by a warder, 'Thou fallest away to the Kasdim' (Jer. xxxvii. 13). The 'princes' before whom Jeremiah was brought were thoroughly hostile to him; both now and on a later occasion their condemnation of the prophet was a foregone conclusion. Doubtless he might have defended himself, but under the circumstances (cp. Jer. xxxviii. 4) could a political tribunal affect impartiality? At any rate, when the Asshurites returned, there may well have seemed to be no room in the beleaguered city for Jeremiah. The princes did not, however, venture to kill the great prophet as Jehoiakim killed Uriah (Jer. xxvi. 23); they would rather that famine should do the work of the executioner. So Jeremiah was cast into the cistern in the court of the prison, and 'sank in the mire' (Jer. xxxviii. 6).

[1] Isa. xxii. 1-14; see my *Introd. to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 135.

[2] There may also have been a plan to utilise the freedmen as additional defenders of the walls.

For the second time Zedekiah interposed for the prophet, though most of the credit is due to a Kushite or N. Arabian[1] eunuch attached to the palace. Nor was Jeremiah backward to act for the good of Zedekiah, who seemed paralysed by his troubles. He recognised the poor king's anxiety for himself, and urged him to take the only course which would at once preserve the city from destruction and save his own life. That Jeremiah himself was free from all self-regarding thoughts, is clear. One of the most striking episodes in his career is his purchase of a small family estate at Anathoth, in deference to a moral claim upon him (Jer. xxxii. 6-15); it was at the beginning of the period of his imprisonment, and while the siege was still raised. Unconsciously, Hanameel, Jeremiah's uncle's son, was a messenger of Yahweh. The prophet now became clear that it was the divine purpose that the land should not be utterly desolate, but that 'houses and fields and vineyards should continue to be acquired therein.' So he wrote and sealed the purchase-deed, took witnesses, paid the covenanted price, and gave the deed to Baruch to preserve.

Certainly the contrast between Jeremiah and Zedekiah is as striking as it could well be. The man in the prison was far more kingly than the man on the throne. It would seem that Zedekiah distrusted the prophet's assurance (Jer. xxxiv. 4 *f.*) that his life would be spared; and so on the ninth day of the fourth month of Zedekiah's eleventh year, this poor king's reign came to an end. A breach had been made in the wall, and there was no more bread. A hurried flight by the ravine of the Kidron, and then all is over. Basely abandoned by his men-at-arms, the king is taken, and conducted to the headquarters of the foe at Riblah, where, as the retribution of his disloyalty, his eyes are put out, his sons and 'all the nobles[2] of Judah' having been previously slain (Jer. xxxix. 6 *f.*, 2 K. xxv. 6 *f.*

At Jerusalem the direction of affairs was assumed by

[1] The sense here given to 'Kushite' is justified elsewhere (see *T. and B.* pp. 170 *f.*, 181). Note also the name Kūshī in 2 S. xviii. 21 *ff.* David himself probably came from the southern borderland, though not from Kūsh.

[2] On the *ḥōrīm*, see Ed. Meyer, *Entstehung*, pp. 132 *f.*

'the captains of the king of Bābel,' seated, like judges, in one of the spacious gateways (Jer. xxxix. 3). But the chief work was left to another high officer, who, after plundering whatever was of value,[1] gave temple and palace, and indeed all the city, to the flames, and broke down the city wall. I wish that there were no importunate problems to distract us. Is it possible, for instance, that Babylon and the N. Arabian Bābel may have been partners in the work of destruction? The names of the 'captains' referred to are partly of Babylonian, partly of N. Arabian origin (p. 57); Nebuzaradan, too, like Nebuchadrezzar, is Babylonian. At any rate, we cannot reject the evidence for two invaders of Judah, or deny that captives were carried away both to Babylon and to N. Arabia.[2] It is by a most unkind fate that the written documents of the exilic and post-exilic age which have been lost have been precisely those which must have referred unmistakably to the Babylonian captivity.

And what was the result of this event for N. Arabia—for Babylon—for Israel? The first part of this question we cannot answer. The history of N. Arabia is to a great extent a sealed book to us. On the other hand, if (as we must believe) the Babylonians were, somehow or other, the destroyers of Jerusalem, we can quite well state the result. It was important to conquer Jerusalem as a step to the reduction of the entire West. The next cities to be mastered were Tyre and Sidon, and the ultimate object, of course, was the possession of Egypt. How far Nebuchadrezzar realised his aspirations, I leave it to special historians to consider.

Nor could I, without a renewed, serious, penetrating criticism of the later portions of the Old Testament, venture to answer the final question, What was the result of the great catastrophe for Israel? The question has, indeed, been answered again and again, but a still more complete and satisfactory answer needs, as it seems to me,

[1] The temple utensils which still remained formed part of the spoil (2 K. xxv. 13-17; Jer. lii. 17-23).

[2] See my sketch of the History of Israel in *The Historians' History of the World* (1908), ii. 24.

to be given. Sooner or later we may trust that it will be given.

SPECIAL NOTES

i. On the Sacred Serpent (Nehushtan) in 2 K. xviii. 4 *b* (p. 4)

There are two possible views of this serpent. It might represent the primeval serpent of chaos and darkness, and (by an allegorising which may have begun pretty early) of evil. In that case it has the nature of an amulet. Or it might be a symbol of the N. Arabian healing god, who went with migrating N. Arabians to Phœnicia, and was there called Eshmun (= Ishmael?) This view is favoured by Num. xxi. 9. The tradition was that the serpent worshipped by the people was that which Moses had made. Probably it was 'a magic symbol which brought the divine Healer near his people' (*T. and B.* p. 42). The divine Healer was not originally Yahweh, but Yeraḥme'el (= Ishmael); indeed, 2 K. xviii. 4 *b* (as originally read) gives, in a gloss, as two current designations of the serpent, Yeraḥme'el (or some form of that name) and Ḥashtan (= Ashḥur-Ethan). These names underlie the very improbable words יקרא לו and נחשתן, to account for which corruptions see my explanations of Judg. xv. 19 (*En-hakkōrē*), Gen. iv. 22, Zech. vi. 1 (*Crit. Bib.* pp. 183, 484; *T. and B.* p. 109). The name Ḥashtan or Ashḥur-Ethan suggests that some at any rate explained the serpent as representing the power which was always dangerous to Israel, whether it happened to be Miṣrim or the more distant Ashḥur. Ezekiel in fact represents Miṣrim as an evil serpent (Ezek. xxix. 3), and two glosses found with great probability in the work of a nameless prophet in 'Isaiah' (Isa. xxvii. 1) explain the leviathan in the eschatological picture as 'the serpent Ashḳal-Ethan,' and 'Asshur in Yaman.' That the symbol of cruel hatred should be worshipped will not surprise any one; it was in order to avert evil. On Mr. Macalister's illustration of

'Nehushtan' by a serpent of bronze found at the great *bāmah* at Gezer, see Père Vincent, *Canaan*, pp. 174-176.

ii. Parallels for a Confusion of Kings in Hebrew Narratives (pp. 29, 61)

1. 1 K. xiv. 25 *f*; 2 Chr. xii. 2-12. A king of Miṣraim (Egypt) called Shishaḳ is said in the pointed text to have assaulted and taken Jerusalem, and plundered the treasuries of the temple and the palace. He is usually identified with Shoshenḳ I. of Egypt (22nd dynasty), who made a successful expedition into Palestine, recorded in the sculptures on the south wall of the great temple at Karnak; the date, however, is unknown. Recently the suggestion has been made that there is probably a confusion between two kings of Miṣraim and Miṣrim respectively. It was, of course, no part of this theory to 'repudiate' the expedition into Palestine recorded by the very king who made it. That is a careless misrepresentation of Prof. Flinders Petrie (*Researches in Sinai*, 1906, p. 195); the theory was produced by the play of mind upon an Egyptian monument, Assyrian inscriptions, and passages of the O.T., and is not therefore a 'fantasy' of 'unchecked literary criticism.'

The collection of cartouches, or ovals with names, was published incompletely by Rosellini and Champollion, but the closing part was first uncovered by M. Legrain in 1901. W. Max Müller, in 1905 (?), found a new line (*Egyptological Researches*, vol. i., plate 85), and by a subsequent collation in the summer of 1906 discovered that a much more important line of the text had been overlooked, viz. the closing line, which had been covered over with bushes and rubbish. This will appear in vol. ii. of *E.R.* The names Raphia and Ekron show that Philistia was not (as had been supposed) omitted in the list (*OLZ*, Apr. 1908, 186-188).

There are three difficulties in the way of the ordinary identification. (*a*) The list includes N. Israelitish ones. The Hebrew text, however, only mentions Jerusalem. It is, of course, open to us to conjecture with W. M. M. formerly [1]

[1] So too G. A. Smith, *Expositor*, March 1905.

(*E. Bib.* col. 4486) that the Egyptian king only conquered Judah, and was content with tribute from 'his old *protégé*,' Jeroboam. Now, however, W. M. M. is less disposed to question Muṣri, and thinks that Shishak's object was, 'not to help Jeroboam, but to gain tribute and spoils from both halves of Palestine.' 'Numerous cities, in fact the first and greater part of the list, belong to Israel, the northern kingdom, and thus give evidence of a conquest of Israel, which our Biblical writers, from their exclusively Judæan standpoint, did not deem worthy of mention.'[1] The Judæan standpoint, however, does not always prevent the mention of events affecting the northern kingdom. Why should it here?

(*b*) Presumably Shoshenḳ reasserted the dormant claims of Egypt to the suzerainty of Palestine. Shishak, however, is not related to have done so. True, 'Zerah the Kushite' is also not said to have done so. But then, there is very great doubt whether this invader with a Semitic name[2] was a king of Egypt.

(*c*) The authority used by the Chronicler (2 Chr. xii. 3) speaks of the Lubim, the Sukkiim, and the Kushites in Shishaḳ's army. 'Hitherto they have not been identified' (Petrie). Lubim, however, is most easily explained as = Kelūbim, *i.e.* Calebites, and Sukkiim is also probably a N. Arabian name.[3] The Kushim and Lubim are also mentioned as forming Zerah's army.

(*d*) If 'Shishaḳ king of מצרים' means 'Shoshenḳ king of Egypt' here, it ought to do so in 1 K. xi. 40. Winckler,[4] however, and the present writer,[5] have shown the improbability of this. But to go further (as they did) and excise 'Shishaḳ' in xi. 40 was an error. To understand proper names, it is absolutely necessary that like should be grouped with like, and that the common element should be accounted for on fixed principles. שישק should therefore be grouped with שַׁשַׁךְ (Jer. xxv. 26, li. 41) and שָׁשָׁק (1 Chr. viii. 14), which are S. Palestinian or N. Arabian names; indeed, שך or שק is a short form of אשכר or אשחר, a regional N. Arabian

[1] *Egyptol. Researches*, i. 51. [2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Zerah.'
[3] Cp. *T. and B.* p. 397. [4] For references see *E. Bib.*, 'Shishak.
[5] *Jewish Quart. Rev.*, July 1899, pp. 558-560.

name. We can now see that Shishaḳ is a development of a shortened form of Ashḥur, and in 1 K. xi. 40, xiv. 25, is the designation of a N. Arabian king, who in the large sense of the word was an Ashḥurite. See *T. and B.* pp. 47, 187, 363.

It is possible, however, that the redactor confounded Shishaḳ with Shoshenḳ, which might easily pass into Shoshaḳ, the Hebrew text-reading. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Shishak' (W. Max Müller).

2. Isa. xx. As most suppose, we have here a prophecy of the deportation of the Egyptians and the Ethiopians into Assyria. But there was no probability of a conquest of Egypt and Ethiopia by Assyria in Isaiah's time. The prophet was too well informed not to know this. מצרים and כוש must therefore mean, not Egypt and Ethiopia, but Miṣrim and Kūsh in N. Arabia. The fatal blow here announced might be expected to come from a greater N. Arabian power with which we are becoming acquainted as Asshur or Ashḥur. The prophet is well assured that the inhabitants of the south of Palestine would take notice of the event, and fear for themselves. At the time when the oracle was given, they were in alliance with Miṣrim. It is inevitable, therefore, to assume a confusion in the redactor's mind between one capture of Ashdod by a N. Arabian Asshurite king, and another by the Assyrian king Sargon. On the criticism of the chapter see Cheyne, *Introd. to Bk. of Isaiah*, pp. 119-121, and *Isaiah* in *SBOT* (Hebrew edition).

3. 2 K. xvii. 6 *a*. It is critically probable that not only from Assyria but from the N. Arabian Asshur invasions might be expected by the peoples of Palestine. In the eighth century Isaiah gave a gloomy view of the future, and, for him, the invader came from the south. Isa. xxviii. 1-4, when scrutinised,[1] proves to contain a prophecy of the conquest of the southern Shōmĕrōn (or Shimron) by the Asshurites. It may be this event which is referred to in 2 K. xvii. 6 *a*, which tells how the king of

[1] See *Crit. Bib.* p. 33, where, however, corrections are required. שמנים most probably comes from ישמנים (= Ishmaelites), הלומי from ירחמאל, and יין from ין (cp. Introduction on this passage).

Asshur took Shōmĕrōn, and carried Israel away to Asshur. It will be found that the place-names and divine names in 2 K. xvii. 24 *ff.* are partly, at any rate, non-Assyrian. There is probably a confusion in the redactor's mind between the capture of Shōmĕrōn or Samaria and a Shōmĕrōn or Shimron in the south (see chap. iii.).

4. 2 K. xviii. 13-xix. It has been supposed—and very naturally—that the discovery by Scheil of a fragment of an official statement of Sennacherib respecting a second expedition to the west provides an easy solution for the literary and historical problems of the composite narrative in 2 Kings.[1] I do not myself think that this is so. To me it appears that the only part of the narrative which refers to Sennacherib is the short extract from the Annals of Judah in 2 K. xviii. 13 *b*-16. The rest of the narrative refers to a N. Arabian Asshurite invasion, and the redactor has made a confusion between the two Asshurs. The names which occur in the narrative are no hindrance; underneath them most probably lie distinctive N. Arabian names. It is now possible to understand the saying of Rab-shakeh in 2 K. xviii. 25 better (cp. pp. 36, 38, on the Chronicler's version of the Neko-narrative). It is not 'haughtiness,' but faith, which inspires it. Rab-shakeh has heard of Yahweh-prophecies, and gives them credit. 'Yahweh said to me, Go up against this land, and destroy it.' At this point it deserves to be mentioned that Sir H. Rawlinson long ago[2] divined that there was a confusion between two invasions; according to him *vv.* 13-16 refer to one, and the rest of the narrative to another, which is not described in the Annals—that which ended in the 'miraculous destruction' of Sennacherib's army. Dr. Hincks,[3] the Irish Assyriologist, on the other hand, supposed a confusion between an invasion by Sargon and one by Sennacherib. Prašek[4] agrees with Rawlinson; Scheil's discovery had not yet been made. Hincks, at any rate, saw that two kings were referred to. Rab-shakeh (= Arab-

[1] Cp. O. Weber, *Sanherib: eine Skizze* (1905), pp. 21-24.
[2] G. Rawlinson, *Herodotus* (ed. 1), i. 479.
[3] *Journal of Sacred Lit.*, Oct. 1858, p. 136.
[4] *Sanheribs Feldzüge gegen Juda*, i. (1903-4).

Asshur) is a N. Arabian officer, and the king is the king of Ashḥur. In *v.* 24 the strange phrase פַּחַת אחד should be פַּחוֹת אשחר. 'Ashḥurite governors' is a gloss on 'servants of my lord.' The names in *v.* 34 cannot here be discussed.

iii. On Jer. xxii. 13-19, 24-30 (p. 52)

I will now endeavour to set forth the grounds of my restoration, starting from the very doubtful word ששר in *v.* 14. After a full discussion Kamphausen[1] arrives at the conclusion that 'a perfectly certain explanation can hardly be obtained.' The context being equally doubtful, one may assume corruption. It should be noticed that a number of words beginning with שש (ששי, ששך, ששן, ששק; cp. p. 87) have turned out to be N. Arabian Asshurite names. One can hardly doubt that the same origin should be assigned to ששר.

From the same point of view it is possible to restore the true opening words of *v.* 13. It was not a house (בית) and upper chambers (עליות) that Jehoiakim thought of building in the southern Asshur, but, as my reference to 2 Chr. xxvii. 4 may already have suggested, and as the reference to Asshur in *v.* 14 further indicates, 'castles' (בית = בירניות) and 'forts' (מגדלות). עליות occurs again in *v.* 14, and should again be corrected (see below). Now, too, we can see that בית מדות (*v.* 14) is not an expansion of the בית in *v.* 13, as if Jehoiakim specially coveted a 'spacious house'; surely Josiah, who had an 'Ishmael-chariot' (p. 39) could have managed to procure a sufficiently roomy palace. The truth is that a fate attaches to מדה and מדות. In the phrases איש מדה (1 Chr. xi. 23) and אנשי מדה (Isa. xlv. 14) certainly,[2] and in אנשי מדות (Num. xiii. 32) probably, מדה or מדות represents a N. Arabian regional name, such as רמת or רמות (where רם represents ארם). Here, too, מדות is more than probably corrupt; the best restoration is מגדלות, which is naturally combined with בירניות, and is a correction of the following עליות. The next words in *v.* 14 ועליות מרוחים

[1] Riehm, *HWB des Bibl. Altertums*(2), 'Mennig.'

[2] In 1 Chr. xi. 23 איש מדה is a gloss on מצרי; in Isa. xlv. 14 אנשי מ' on the preceding regional or ethnic names.

are commonly rendered 'and airy upper chambers.' But how can the feminine noun be combined with a masculine participle? Cornill proposes to point מרוחים, a word which can hardly be said to exist, and which, if it did exist, would produce an unsuitable sense. Surely the approximately right correction lies close at hand—מגדלות בירחם.

That the next clause is specially difficult, Cornill is well aware. Here I can only call attention to what is most important. בששר has been explained already, but why is it linked to וּמָשׁוֹחַ? And what is to be done with וְסָפוֹן בארז? Surely the stress laid on cedar-wood (cp. *v.* 15 *a*) is unreasonable. From our point of view the questions can be satisfactorily answered. בששר and בארז are parallel. ארז, like זרח[1] and אזרח, represents אשחר. There is no violence in this, nor is there any difficulty in penetrating the mystery of ספון, which is certainly miswritten for צָפוֹן, here (as in Josh. xiii. 27) a place-name.[2] משוח remains; it must be a corruption of a place-name, probably of רמשח[3] (sometimes less correctly written רמשק). The crown will be put on our restoration if we succeed in accounting for וקרע לו חלוני. It is not enough to put on ו to חלוני; the ordinary rendering of the clause is not natural. Nor can we venture to connect the חלוני of MT. with the architectural term in Assyrian, *bīt ḫilani*, 'fortified portico.'[4] Clearly since fortified towns are spoken of, וקרע is best corrected into וּבָקַע (see 2 Chr. xxi. 17, Isa. vii. 6 [Hiphil], and חלוני וספון into יחלון בצפון. The place-name is not attested elsewhere, but we do find חלון (Josh. xv. 51) and חילן (1 Chr. vi. 43). באזרח is a duplicate reading; בצפון suffices. At the opening of the Jehoiakim-section we should simply read הַבִּנָה, as Cornill, following 𝔊. It is a description.

Verse 15 looks simpler, but has its own difficulties. How can התמלך possibly mean 'callest thou that being a king' (Cornill)? Duhm would read התתמלך, 'showest thou thyself a king?' Both interpretations imply that the next words refer to Jehoiakim's preference for cedar-wood in his buildings. But, as we have seen, ארז may, when circumstances favour this, be an offshoot of אשחר, and we shall

[1] Cp. 'Zeraḥ the Kushite.'
[2] On צפון see p. 42.
[3] See *T. and B.* p. 261 (n. 2).
[4] See Muss-Arnolt, s.v. *xilani*.

now be prepared to admit that אחז, which 𝔊ᴮ presupposes instead of ארז, may represent אזרח, *i.e.* אשחר. These things, in fact, are only strange when we have no reservoir of experience to fall back upon. It is from this reservoir that we have to draw the analogies which make another suggestion as natural as it is indispensable. This suggestion is that אחאב, presupposed by 𝔊ᴬ instead of ארז (אזרה), is really an equivalent of the word underlying ארז, being a sort of popular symbol for עֲרַב אשחר, 'Arabian Ashḥur.'[1] The sense therefore remains the same, whichever of these three readings we find reason to prefer. And what as to מתחרה? Cornill's note only shows how difficult, nay how impossible, the received text is. But now that we have restored the 'castles' and 'forts' to their proper place, it should not be difficult to restore the right word here. Must we not read מתגרה (Dt. ii. 5, 19)? And having proceeded thus far in connecting our passage with the history of the times (cp. pp. 50 *f.*), must we not give התמלך the meaning (which obviously it can thoroughly bear), 'Shalt thou continue to reign?' The idea is that neither courage nor some few warlike successes will be a sure foundation for a throne, and take the place of judicial accuracy and attention to the rights of the poor. Josiah, as we shall hear presently, possessed these royal virtues, and was rewarded by prosperity; by the same divine principle of retributive justice Jehoiakim must fall.

And now as to the prophet's eulogy of Josiah (*vv.* 15 *b*-16). The passage continues in MT., 'Did not thy father eat and drink, and execute right and justice,—then it was well with him?' 'Eat and drink' is surely unsatisfactory, and 𝔊, which renders nearly the same text, gives no real help. We turn, then, to the moderns. According to Duhm, the first characteristic of Josiah mentioned by Jeremiah is his plain, bourgeois manner of life. Cornill, however, thinks that it is not the simplicity of his life, but his frank enjoyment of royal luxuries, for which, together with his devotion to judicial duties, Josiah is praised. But how strange that the same phrase should equally well mean

[1] Similar corruptions occur in Hos. iii. 1, iv. 18, viii. 13, ix. 10, xi. 4, xii. 8, Mic. vi. 16; cp. *T. and B.* pp. 63 (n. 4), 286 (n. 3), 308.

either bourgeois simplicity or royal luxury! That something is wrong with the text, which here becomes unmetrical, is plain. Order will be restored if we cancel אז טוב לו in *v.* 15 (at the same time restoring לו in the phrase in *v.* 16), and above all omit שתה[ו] אכל,[1] underneath which lie אשכל and שתה, *i.e.* אשתר. 'Ashkal' and 'Ashtar' are suitable glosses on the ארז underlying ארז. It is almost needless to repeat that אשכל (Gen. xiv. 13, etc.) is not to be read 'Eshkel' (as it = 'cluster'), but 'Ashkal' = Asshur-Yerah-me'el.[2] Our prophet-poet has said that going to war with Ezrah will not avert the dangers by which Jehoiakim is threatened; the gloss reminds us that other, perhaps more familiar, names for the N. Arabian border-land are Ashkal and Ashtar. At a later age these archaic words had themselves become corrupted, and increased the misunderstanding of the passage.

On *vv.* 24-30. I must notice (after others) that in *v.* 24 'son of Jehoiakim king of Judah' is of course an interpolation, and that the suffix for 'thee' should presumably be the suffix for 'him.' *Vv.* 25-27 are poor and in good part prosaic. They seem intended to link *v.* 24 with *v.* 28. In *v.* 28 'this man,' 'broken' (נפוץ), and 'he and his seed' are plainly scribal superfluities. As to על הארץ אֲשֶׁר לאי דעו it has already been doubted by Duhm; his remedy, to read עלי הארץ, 'upon the earth,' seems, however, rather weak. The truth seems to be that אֲשֶׁר, as often,[3] should probably be אִשֶּׁה; לא ידעו, in this case, is a scribe's endeavour to make sense of a misread אִשֶּׁה; the article in הארץ is also scribal. The troublesome *v.* 29 (observe Cornill's perplexity) is also the scribe's attempt to make sense of material before him. ארץ (thrice in M.T., twice in ⑥) should only occur once; שמעו has come from a corrupt ישמעאל; ארץ ישמ' is probably a gloss on ארץ אֲשֶׁר. For the overworking visible in *v.* 30 it is sufficient to refer to the commentaries of Duhm and Cornill.

[1] It is a common thing for one or two of the letters of a regional or place-name to be lost. Thus אחר often represents אשחר. See also *T. and B.* p. 109.

[2] *T. and B.* p. 247; cp. pp. 18, 23.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 328.

iv. The Kasdim of Habakkuk (p. 64)

It would make these pages too dry, and would be too much of a digression, to mention all the evidence which exists for the N. Arabian reference of the composite Book of Habakkuk, and especially of that portion which may fairly be assigned to the prophet Habakkuk. For that I must refer once more to the appeal for a more thorough criticism of the book in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, October 1907. But I may remark that in Hab. i. 16 the Ḥashramim (Kasdim) are most probably spoken of as offering sacrifices of thanksgiving, not to 'their net' and 'their drag,' but to 'Yarḥam' and to 'Raḳmith' (*i.e.* to the supreme god of N. Arabia and his consort). That scribes and editors of Habakkuk should have inserted glosses to explain חשרמים (כשדים) is not surprising. Two such glosses may be mentioned, both of which, at different places, made their way into the text, and became corrupt, viz., הוא אשתור, 'that is, Ashtor,' and הם בני ירקם, 'they are the benê Yarḳam (Yarḥam).' Of course the use of the name Ḥashramim (or Ḥashrim?) is archaistic.

v. Note on Ezek. xvii. 3, 4 (p. 67)

Not to repeat from my predecessors, let me turn at once to the difficult pair of phrases, ארץ כנען and עיר רכלים. The former is most naturally rendered 'the land of Canaan,' the latter 'the city of merchants.' Clearly, however, these renderings cannot represent the prophet's meaning. Feeling this, translators have abandoned the natural meaning of כנען, and substituted 'traffickers' (A.V. 'traffic'), because the Phœnicians were in their time the leading commercial people. There is, however, no other passage in which כנען will bear this rendering. The other passages quoted are Zeph. i. 11, Ezek. xvi. 29. But, as to the first, though 'the people of Canaan' might conceivably mean 'the Phœnician merchants,' yet 'the land of Canaan' (Ezek. xvii. 4) could not possibly be explained 'the land of merchants,' with a depreciating reference to Babylonia.

And the same criticism must unavoidably be passed on the customary rendering of אל-ארץ כנען כשדימה (xvi. 29), 'to the land of merchants, to Chaldæa.' Clearly, then, כנען must in xvii. 4, as elsewhere, be a regional name, and some regional or at least ethnic name must underlie רכלים. The solution of the problem is pointed to in the article 'Merchant' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. In Neh. iii. 31, 32 רכלים, or less incorrectly רכמלים, has come from the ethnic ירחמאלים; in Cant. iii. 6 רוכל has for its original ירחמאל. To complete the solution let it be pointed out that עיר has not unfrequently come from ער, *i.e.* עֲרָב (see *e.g.* Gen. x. 11, Judg. i. 16, 1 S. xv. 5); also that there was a southern 'Canaan' in N. Arabia—the name was in remote times carried northward in the Arabian migration. Thus we get as the rendering of Ezek. xvii. 4,

'He cropped off the topmost growth thereof, and brought it to the land of Canaan; in Arabia of Yeraḥme'el he set it.'

On the southern Canaan see further *T. and B.* pp. 85, 175, 475, 550. It is interesting that Ezekiel (xvi. 3) traces the origin of Jerusalem to 'the land of the Canaanite,' and presently uses 'Amorite' and 'Hittite' as equivalent to 'Canaanite.' Now, we are nowhere told that Hittites dwelt in Jerusalem; in fact, 'wherever Hittites are mentioned the surrounding contexts favour the view that a N. Arabian people is intended' (*T. and B.* p. 194).

PART II

THE LAW-BOOKS (EXCEPTING THE PRIESTLY CODE)

CHAPTER I

THE TWO DECALOGUES—THE BOOK OF COVENANT

As far as we know, the young Israelite people had no royal codifier of its laws—no Ḥammurabi. It is true that Josiah (as we have seen) was deeply interested in a certain law-book, but no one can claim that he originated either this or any other book of *torah*. Nor does such a distinction belong even to that darling of Hebrew legend, Solomon, though this king is expressly said in tradition to have been a model of judicial correctness (1 K. iii. 28). Indeed, we may safely hold that if there were a civil and religious law in written form among the early Israelites, it must have been derived either from the Canaanites or from the N. Arabians,[1] or from both. For the existence of legal codes is a sign of no slight social progress, and the Israelitish communities, being younger than either of those peoples, and in general the debtors of both, must surely have been in this as well as in other respects their pupils. Constantly it would happen that Israelitish families fell into, or even deliberately adopted, Canaanitish or N. Arabian practices, and for them a law-book was obviously desirable, and if none such existed, the priests of Canaan or N. Arabia would not fail to prepare it. The extent to which, in these circumstances, the transformation of Israel proceeded can be easily imagined. It may be a late prophet who says (Mic. vi. 16), that 'the statutes of the Arammites are

[1] It is interesting that Solomon's two scribes were 'bêne Shisha' (1 K. iv. 3), *i.e.* 'benê Ishmael' or N. Arabians, and that David's scribe, according to 1 Chr. xviii. 16, was Shawsha, *i.e.* Ishmael. See *T. and B.* p. 288.

observed, and all the practices of the house of Aḥ'ab,'[1] but the same words might have been written much earlier; and for the due observance of statutes of non-Israelite origin, even though Judah may have swarmed with N. Arabian priests,[2] a law-book was indispensable. The Canaanites and N. Arabians, in virtue of their precedence, must have suggested the idea, but we can well believe that the idea was quickly assimilated, and that highly rudimentary Israelitish law-books were forthcoming under the pressure of circumstances, as, for instance, when Canaanites wished to enter an Israelitish community that remained true to its religion. At any rate, both in Canaanitish or N. Arabian and in Israelitish sanctuaries such books, based on the records of priestly decisions, would beyond question be produced at the fitting time.

Nor can we doubt that even those early law-books were quickly invested with the halo of sanctity, and were said to have been received from the supreme God by some ancient priest, or prophet, or king. More particularly would this be the case when a law-book of greater length and complexity proceeded from some specially venerated sanctuary. Such a work would throw inferior law-books into the shade, and either temporarily or permanently be called *the* law-book *par excellence* of that ancient hero. It would be absurd to carp at the morality of this procedure. Was it not reasonable to hold that the civil and religious laws systematised in such a collection were such as the reputed initiator of the legislation, returning to earth, would have sanctioned, *i.e.* that they were virtually Mosaic (cp. Mt. xi. 14)? And if this explanation be thought too subtle for many of those priests who called such a law-book Mosaic, and taught the people accordingly, may we carp at these less clever but not less devout men for their greater *naïveté*? In fact there were some who even presumed to assert that the two tables of stone were 'written with the finger of Elohim'[3]—a

[1] *T. and B.* p. 63 (n. 4).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 62, with n. 1. Cp. Lev. xviii. 3 (prohibition of Miṣrite and Canaanite practices).

[3] Ex. xxxi. 18, cp. xxxii. 16. Note that in xxxiv. 1 כתבת might be read either as תִּ— or as תָּ—. Apart from this, the whole of *v.* 1 *b*, כראשנים in

childlike way of expressing the idea of revelation,[1] which may be compared with the mythic story of the heavenly tablets in the Books of Enoch and Jubilees—sometimes identified with the Pentateuch.[2]

It has been stated already that the chief pre-exilic law-book in its original form was possibly or probably intended for the use of the Israelites in N. Arabia. Later on we shall have to collect the evidence for this view. Nor can we regard it as *a priori* improbable that some elements, at least, of other law-books may have had a similar origin. The case will present itself in the course of our study of the so-called 'Book of Covenant,' which being, like the Code of Ḥammurabi[3] and that of Deuteronomy, composite, offers a fair field to the searcher after surprises.

It is a misfortune that we cannot determine the age of the Book of Covenant as a whole, and of its several parts, or that of the two decalogues of which I shall next speak. The consequence is that these works give very little help for exact historical research, though for the vaguer subject of the development of religious and social ideas they supply valuable material. We can, however, venture to say that the collection of laws in Ex. xxxiv. 17-26 (preserved by J, *i.e.* the Yahwist) is the oldest extant Hebrew work of the kind. It stands in connexion with a narrative which tells us, very simply and without any admixture of mythology, how Moses 'hewed out two (fresh) tables of stone' (*v.* 4), and 'wrote upon the tables the ten words' (*v.* 28). From this statement we see that what J furnishes is really a rival narrative to that of E (the Elohist); it is now placed in the background, because it could not be combined with E's account of the giving of the Decalogue in Ex. xx.[4] It is true that, as the text of J now stands, the words are not ten,

v. 1 *a*, as well as all *v.* 4, seem to belong to the redactor, who thus made a bridge between chaps. xxxii.-xxxiii. and chap. xxxiv. (Wellhausen, *CH*[2] p. 330.) See also Carpenter-Battersby, *Hex.* ii. 134.

[1] *T. and B.* p. 568.

[2] See references in Zimmern, *KAT*[3], pp. 540 *f.* The Babylonian origin is obvious.

[3] See D. G. Lyon, 'The Structure of the Hammurabi Code,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xxv. [1904], pp. 258-278.

[4] Wellhausen.

but eleven. If, however, we omit the command that all the men of Israel shall appear before their God thrice in the year, as unnecessary in the context, we obtain a Decalogue. And if we omit explanations where they occur, so as to restore the 'terse and simple form' of primitive laws, and further transpose the laws in *v.* 18 and *v.* 19, and accept certain important textual corrections, so as to get nearer to the underlying original text, we shall arrive at the following form of decalogue :—

1. Thou shalt worship no other divinity (*el*).
2. Thou shalt make for thyself no molten gods (*elōhê massekah*).
3. Every first-born is mine.
4. Six days thou shalt work, and on the seventh day rest.
5. Thou shalt keep the feast of unleavened bread at the time of the month Arāb.[1]
6. Thou shalt keep the feast of weeks, and the feast of ingathering at the turn of the year.
7. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven.
8. The fat of my festal sacrifice shall not remain unto the morning.
9. The best of the first-fruits of thy land thou shalt bring to the house of Yahweh thy God.
10. Thou shalt not put on the garment of a Yerahme'elite woman.[2]

Neither this decalogue nor (much less) that in Ex. xx. can be called primitive. A legislation which forbids the use of graven or molten images implies that art has already been pressed into the service of religion, and though we may admit that moral duties must have been recognised by the authors of the decalogue in Ex. xxxiv., yet the fact that this decalogue is, and the other is not, purely religious (in the narrower sense), requires a considerable interval between the two. That the former decalogue (Ex. xxxiv.) is, even if not primitive, relatively early, cannot, of course, be denied.

[1] See on Dt. xvi. 1.

[2] See *T. and B.* pp. 564 *f.*

The first two commands, it is true, are almost identical with the corresponding ones in the greater decalogue, but Ex. xx. 3 *f.* belongs to an element in that decalogue which is at once early and late. At the time when that passage was produced, it was still needful to protest against Yeraḥme'el's being placed 'in front' of Yahweh, and against either Yeraḥme'el's or Yahweh's being worshipped under the form of a graven or molten steer.[1] The tenth command in the earlier decalogue is one among other monuments of the opposition of the Yahwists to a dangerous N. Arabian cult, and will be referred to again in connexion with Dt. xiv. 21, xxii. 5. It will be noticed that I do not, like Wellhausen, omit the Sabbath-law. The form in which this command appears in Ex. xxxiv. 21 *a* is so different from what we might expect, and from what we find in Ex. xx. 9, 10 *a*, that it is safer to retain it, only in a different place.[2]

And now for the translation of the greater decalogue. I omit as late insertions the supplementary passages in the two forms of the Sabbath-law (in Ex. xx. and Dt. v.); also the preamble, 'I am Yahweh thy God,[3] who brought thee out of the land of Miṣrim, out of the territory of Arabia,'[4] though it is quite in the spirit of the commands (cp. Ex. xxxii. 4 *b*, 1 K. xii. 28 *b*). I may add that the supplement of the second command contains an intrusive gloss stating that the makers of graven images, who 'hate' Yahweh, are Arabians or Ishmaelites.[5] The images are images of Yeraḥme'el (= Baal); cp. Hos. ii. 10 (8).

1. Thou shalt not have other gods in front of me.
2. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven image.
3. Thou shalt not pronounce the name of Yahweh thy God for vanity.
4. Remember (Dt., observe) the Sabbath day to hallow it.

[1] See Ex. xxxii. 4, 1 K. xii. 28; and cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K., and *T. and B.* pp. 35, 509.

[2] So B. Baentsch and K. Budde.

[3] Perhaps, however, here, and in the third command, we should read 'Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el,' which was the fuller name of Israel's God (*T. and B.* pp. 16, 28 *f.*, 33, 35, 563).

[4] *T. and B.* p. 549.

[5] On the textual corruption see *T. and B.* p. 564.

5. Honour thy father and thy mother.
6. Thou shalt not murder.
7. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
8. Thou shalt not steal.
9. Thou shalt not bear false (Dt., vain = false) witness against thy neighbour.
10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house.[1]

The date of this decalogue has been much discussed without any decisive result. There is, at any rate, the possibility that it may be post-exilic. The use of *shabbath* in the fourth command for the weekly rest-day has suggested to Meinhold a date not earlier than Ezekiel, who not only refers to the sabbath, but lays the greatest stress on its exact observance ('my sabbaths'). For my own part, I have a doubt whether יום השבת has not been altered from יום השביעי, 'the seventh day' (see, in the first decalogue, Ex. xxxiv. 21). At any rate, the absence of any very definite hostile reference[2] to the cultus of N. Arabia, such as we find at the close of the first decalogue, makes the second less important for historical purposes, unless, indeed, we point to the depreciation of forms of cultus implied in the fourth, and to the heart-searching character of the tenth[3] of the commandments in Ex. xx. We are undoubtedly fortunate in possessing law-books like the first Decalogue and the Book of Covenant, belonging, as appears most probable, to the early regal period.

It is the Book of Covenant (Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. 33) to which we have now to direct our attention. This little document, the origin of which, unlike that of Deuteronomy, is unrecorded, has of late received much special study. It is superfluous for me to summarise the work of others,[4] but as regards the relations of this law-book to the Code of Ḫammurabi I may record the opinion that influence of the latter upon the former is far from probable; to prove

[1] Dt. transfers 'house' to the supplement, and substitutes 'wife,' which Ex. rightly places in its supplement.

[2] Unless one be implied in the first command.

[3] But why should not 'coveting' have been accounted a sin comparatively early?

[4] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Law and Justice,' § 4; 'Law Literature,' §§ 6-9.

such a thesis a much larger amount of plausible evidence would have to be found. That both the Book of Covenant and Deuteronomy may contain elements of non-Israelitish origin can be admitted, but not that any of these came, except indirectly, from Babylon. From Canaan and from N. Arabia direct loans may, or rather must, have been effected, but not from Babylon. Of course the comparative study of the Code of Ḥammurabi and other legal collections is both ethically and juristically important, but with that we are not here concerned.

On the composition of the Book of Covenant there is general agreement. It is made up partly of a series of Divine Words containing directions as to religion and worship, partly of a collection of Judgments, or judicial decisions (of the king or the priest), adapted, like those in Ḥammurabi's Code, to particular cases. The opening direction (Ex. xx. 24, see p. 114) is very interesting. The legislator endorses the objection to the use of iron in the shaping of altar-stones, and opposes the tendencies which may early have arisen, assigning a special sanctity to some leading sanctuary, and have led in some degree to the centralisation of justice.[1] He says that wherever, according to the sacred story, Yahweh has met his worshippers, an altar either of earth or of unhewn stones may be raised to the Deity. Considering that, in the earlier form of that story, the scene of the theophanies was in some part of the N. Arabian border-land,[2] it is possible that this passage may have come from some law-book intended for Israelites residing in N. Arabia. The difficulty of deciding on the original context of this antique prescription may perhaps be relieved by this theory. It is possible that some of the laws in Ex. xxii. 17-xxiii. 19 (see *e.g.* xxii. 19, xxiii. 19 *b*, besides Dt. xvi. 21 *f.*) may also have belonged to such a document. Let us turn first to xxii. 19 (20). It has been shown elsewhere[3] why the MT. cannot be right, and that the

[1] Cp. Cook, *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Ḥammurabi*, pp. 44 *f.*

[2] See *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel* (1907).

[3] See *T. and B.* pp. 28 *f.* The closing words, 'except Yahweh alone,' are defended as they stand by Eerdmans (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1894,

original text must have run, 'Thou shalt sacrifice to Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el alone.' This was no doubt suitable enough in Canaan, but had a special fitness in the S. border-land, where the worship of Baal or Yeraḥme'el as the supreme member of the Divine Company was inveterate. Next, with regard to xxiii. 19 *b*. Evidently some more important matter than 'seething a kid' was referred to in the original text, as indeed appears from the recurrence of the command elsewhere (see xxxiv. 26, Dt. xiv. 21, and what is said on these passages in the present work). The N. Arabian cultus is, in fact, touched here at a vital point.

The Book of Covenant is, in fact, another monument, however small, of the old Israelitish religion, which even in its purer form had a strong polytheistic element. One may refer in this connexion to the much-disputed passage, Ex. xxi. 6, where *hā-elōhīm* means neither the judges nor any sanctuary of Yahweh, but the company of the great gods, whose director was sometimes said to be Yeraḥme'el, sometimes Yahweh, and images or symbols of whom stood probably in every house[1] 'behind the door and the post' (Isa. lvii. 8 ; cp. Ex. xxi. 6). It was in the sacred presence of these deities that the time-honoured custom described in the law was carried out. It was they, too, who decided even on small trespasses, such as occurred continually in daily life (Ex. xxii. 8, note the plural verb).

Immediately after the law about seething kids (?) begins the closing section of the book (xxiii. 20-33). It appears to be an amplified version of a hortatory discourse, which may or may not[2] be in its original place, but, so far as its kernel is concerned, is certainly the work of the Elohistic school (E). It commands the sole worship of Yahweh, who promises to send a great Being called Mal'ak to conduct Israel to the place prepared for it. Mal'ak will brook no disobedience, for 'my name is in him.' In *v.* 23 (and xxxii. 34) he is called Mal'aki, a form which 𝔊 and Sam.

p. 285), on the ground that Yahweh, though alone worthy of sacrifice, is one of the Elohim (*i.e.* the supernatural beings). That is true, but does not make the text-reading natural.

[1] According to Eerdmans household gods are referred to.

[2] Plainly *vv.* 20-22 do not cohere with what precedes.

also support in *v.* 20,[1] and which, like Mal'ak, has been shown with high probability to have been produced (in a theological interest) out of a corrupt form of 'Yeraḥme'el,' the name of the supreme N. Arabian God, who, to the early Israelites, was still divine, but inferior to the great divine director Yahweh.[2] It is true, the name Mal'ak suggests the meaning 'messenger,' but the inadequacy of this meaning is obvious. How, indeed, can 'face' (*pānīm*) and 'messenger' be equally original and appropriate names of one who was really the second member of the divine duad or triad? For 'face,' too, is a name of this great and good, though sometimes stern, deity; 'my face shall go,' says Yahweh elsewhere (Ex. xxxiii. 14), 'and I (through Him) will give thee rest.'[3]

To bring Israel to 'rest' was, of course, Yahweh-Mal'ak's first object, but this by itself would not have sufficed. A powerful enemy had to be conquered; the present inhabitants of the promised land had to be thrust out (Ex. xxiii. 28). It was therefore added that a divinely wrought terror (a panic) should come upon them, and that if any of the foes should find a momentary refuge in some inaccessible nooks, the swarms of hornets (cp. Isa. vii. 18), well known, perhaps, from some ancient poem, should find them out. Then (*v.* 29*f.* being obviously a redactional insertion) the same writer specifies the boundaries of the original promised land (*v.* 31). It is not the only passage which gives this information; *e.g.* there is Dt. xi. 24, on which I shall have to dwell later. The boundaries are 'from the Yam-Suph as far as to the Yam-Pelishtim, and from the desert to the stream.' What does this mean? 1. As to Yam-Suph. Elsewhere[4] this difficult phrase has been traced with some probability to an earlier form—Yaman-Sophereth (or Ṣarephath). 2. As to Yam-Pelishtim.

[1] See, further, *T. and B.* p. 279.

[2] There were, of course, opposing currents, and at times Baal supplanted Yahweh.

[3] In Ex. xxiii. 15 we again meet with 'my face.' Yeraḥme'el could be spoken of as the divine representative in the cultus as well as in the journeyings. See, further, *T. and B.* pp. 40, 58-60, 101, 277-280, 291-294, 318, etc.

[4] See on Suph, Dt. i. 1, and cp. *T. and B.* p. 551.

That Pelishtim and Pelethim are really identical, and that Pelethim (original vowels partly uncertain) comes from אתבעלים = תפלים, has also been shown already.[1] Yam-Pelishtim, therefore, probably represents Yaman Ethba'alim. Thus in one direction the promised land extended from Yaman of Sophereth to Yaman of the Ishmaelites (or of some particular tribe of Ishmael). In Zech. ix. 10, Ps. lxxii. 8 the statement is more meagre, מים עד־ים. 3. Next, as to the wilderness (so, too, Dt. xi. 24). We cannot venture on identifications, but may suspect that the wilderness meant is that of Shur, *i.e.* the southern Asshur or Ashḥur,[2] which, from Gen. xxv. 18, 1 S. xv. 7 (cp. 𝔊[B]), appears to have adjoined the land of Miṣrim. 4. As to the stream (נהר). Both here and in Dt. xi. 24 (see note) the stream referred to is apparently that of Ephrath; Ephrath (also Ephraim?) was the name of a district in N. Arabia.[3] Hence it would seem that the land extended in another direction from the wilderness of Asshur to the stream of Ephrath. How far these boundaries are correctly given, it is impossible to say.

The parallelism between Ex. xxiii. 28, 31 and Dt. xi. 23 *f.* is obvious. The ideas must have been the commonplaces of the writers of religious history from the time of the Elohist onwards. Not that the Elohist (E) is the sole producer of the close of the book before us; the original close has been amplified by a redactor of the Deuteronomic school. Respecting this redactor there is one point specially deserving of notice, viz., that he understood the original significance of the name Mal'ak or Mal'aki, for he makes Yahweh say, 'Mal'aki shall go before thee . . . and I will cut them off' (*v.* 13).

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 161, 312; also Introduction.
[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Shur'; *T. and B.* pp. 269, 559.
[3] *T. and B.* pp. 262, 419.

CHAPTER II

DEUTERONOMY—INTRODUCTORY

We now pass on to a book which in its present form somewhat resembles the Book of Covenant—Deuteronomy. In an earlier form it was 'found' by Hilkiah in the temple. As we have seen, the priest so named is not to be carped at for his statement on grounds derived from modern Western morality. It was probably in accordance with ancient priestly usage that he said to Shaphan, or to those whom 'Shaphan' represents, that he had found the great 'book of direction.' As so often happens in the East, more was meant than met the ear; 'subterfuge,' as we use the word, does not account for it.[1] Certainly, the cause of morality gained from the publication of Deuteronomy. Why was it that N. Arabian religion was required by that book to be extirpated? Because, on the whole, it was adverse to a progressive morality. On the other hand, the fine spirit of humanity which animates the Deuteronomic legislation proves that the morality of its compilers was truly progressive. The considerate treatment of the stranger (*gēr*) deserves the highest admiration. On this and other topics, see *E. Bib.*, 'Deuteronomy,' 'Law and Justice,' 'Law Literature.' The kindness to animals required in xxii. 6 *f.*, xxv. 4, also deserves notice; xiv. 21 *b*, xxii. 10, however, cannot be mentioned here.[2]

Some able critics have called Hilkiah's law-book the program of the strict Yahwistic party. Here again

[1] Cp. H. P. Smith, *Old Testament History* (1903), p. 261.

[2] See notes below. Sternberg, *Die Ethik des Deuteronomiums* (1908), pp. 98 *f.*, bases his view on the MT.

modernism (if the word may be so applied) has led to a misunderstanding. The conception of a party program is taken from our own political system, which may perchance be the best for ourselves, but certainly receives no support from ancient Oriental history. In the present case it has apparently been overlooked by program-hunters, that the Deuteronomic legislation contains much that is not distinctively applicable to the age of Josiah. We can therefore only venture to say that the religious details of the book are in full accordance with what Hilkiah desired the king to restore as the basis of the national life.

As to the extent of our document, it most probably included a considerable part of Dt. xii.-xxvi., redacted, adapted for a new sphere of influence, and furnished with a preamble and a conclusion. Our object here is to search the original record and its various accretions for any fresh facts bearing on the religious history of Israel, and especially for any textual phenomena which point to an underlying text referring to N. Arabia. I say, N. Arabia, not Egypt. It is a matter of no slight importance (1) that there is only one passage in the whole of Deuteronomy in which an Egyptian custom really does appear to be mentioned, and (2) that that passage is outside the earliest part of the book. I refer to the description of Egyptian irrigation in Dt. xi. 10, which, however, is not as clear as could be wished. The supposed reference in xvii. 16 to the royal monopoly of the horse-trade with Egypt disappears on a close examination.

A general survey of the Deuteronomic legislation will, of course, not be expected. Something may, however, appropriately be said about the law of the one sanctuary (Dt. xii. 5, etc.). The legislator cannot possibly have intended it to apply to every region or district in which Israelites were settled. That he designed it for the N. Arabian district (see pp. 19 *f.*), where he himself dwelt, is certain; he did not design it for Israelitish Canaan, nor would he have imposed it on the pre-exilic Israelitish settlements which may have existed in his time in Egypt and Mesopotamia.[1] He did, however, doubtless approve of

[1] See the publications of Sayce and Cowley, Sachau, Schiffer.

its subsequent adaptation—so easily carried out—to the use of Israel in Canaan. As to the fortunes of the N. Arabian sanctuary, I would, of course, not speak dogmatically. There is no extant literary trace of the existence of such a temple in Josiah's time, but we do hear (2 K. xxiii. 8 *b*) of the destruction of certain *bāmōth* at a place which bears the same name as that of the supposed seat of the one sanctuary (see on Dt. xii. 5) of the N. Arabian Israelites. That sanctuary was perhaps not much, if at all, injured in the final invasion. We hear of eighty pilgrims bringing offerings to this house of Yahweh (it can hardly be another) after the fall of Jerusalem and the burning of its temple (see p. 28). The story may, of course, be fictitious, and yet there may have been at the period referred to a temple in N. Arabia to which Israelite pilgrims could bring offerings. If so, the idea is not an absurd one that psalms may have been composed there by temple-ministers, and that some of them may, like the famous law-book, have been brought from this sanctuary to the restored temple of Jerusalem, there to be altered and even transformed (though not quite beyond recognition) for the use of later generations. As I have ventured to say elsewhere, Ps. cxxii. is one of those in the Psalter which can with most plausibility be traced to the sanctuary in the border-land, and 'next to it stand Pss. cxxv., and cxxxiii., cxxxiv. in their earlier forms.'[1]

Another point may be mentioned in this connexion, viz. that there is one passage in the central part of Deut. which actually presupposes the existence of a number of sanctuaries. The passage is xvi. 21, where it is forbidden to raise Asherahs, or rather Ashhur-trees (see p. 113), beside altars dedicated to Yahweh. The passage has evidently been removed from its original context, perhaps indeed from a different book—one of N. Arabian origin. A similar suggestion has been made already with regard to Ex. xx. 24-26, xxii. 19 (20), xxiii. 19 *b*; one's impression is that Dt. xvi. 21 might perhaps have stood after the first of these passages. We now proceed to a special study of the great law-book.

[1] *The Book of Psalms* (1904), ii. 184.

CHAPTER III

THE LEGISLATIVE KERNEL (CHAPS. XII.-XXVI.)

THE opening of our 'document' may be fitly illustrated from the Book of Covenant. This record, in its present form, opens (Ex. xx. 23-25) with a prohibition of gold and silver gods (cp. Hos. ii. 10), also with directions respecting the right construction of altars, and a definition of the right sanctuaries. Similarly the greater law-book begins (Dt. xii. 2-7) with directions to destroy the wrong sanctuaries and objects of worship (cp. vii. 5), and to recognise but one sanctuary of Yahweh, the name of which, in the final form of the law-book, is wrapped in mystery. To emphasise the number (cp. Jer. xi. 13) of these *mĕḳōmōth*, or holy places, they are described as being 'upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every *raʿanan* tree.' What can *raʿanan* mean? It is something more than philological curiosity which prompts the question. The solution of verbal problems sometimes produces fresh evidence for disputed facts.

The moderns waver between 'sappy-green' and 'luxuriant,' 'spreading.' Indeed the meaning had already become uncertain when the Egyptian-Greek version was made. Evidently it is not a mere rhetorical epithet; it distinguishes the trees which are suitable for holy places from those which are not. It will be best to group it with other tree-names, and seek for some explanation which will, *mutatis mutandis*, be applicable to all. Such an one can, in fact, be supplied on the assumption that the Israelites had a close connexion with N. Arabia, which has left its marks here and there in their phraseology.

The parallel tree-names are—(*a*) עץ שמן and (*b*) זית שמן; these may safely be explained 'tree of Ishman,' 'olive-tree of Ishman' (= Ishmael). (*c*) אשל (Gen. xxi. 23), '(tree of) Ishmael.' (*d*) עץ עבות (Neh. viii. 15), 'tree of Ethbaal' (= Ishmael). (*e*) אלמגים, 'Yeraḥme'el-trees.' (*f*) תאשור, 'tree of Asshur.' (*g*) הדס (= חרס = אשחר), '(tree of) Ashḥur.' (*h*) זית יצהר (2 K. xviii. 32) 'olive-tree of Ashḥur.' Accepting these very natural explanations, can we help tracing רענן to ירחמאל through the linking form רעמן? To justify this, one may refer to ענר (Gen. xiv. 13) and ארנן (Num. xxi. 13), both of which also come from modifications of ירחמאל. If *rimmon*, like *ra'anan*, comes from *ra'aman* or *yeraḥme'el*, we may conjecture that the Ra'aman-tree, or one of the Ra'aman-trees, was a pomegranate, a tree which, in Phœnician Cyprus, was sacred to Adonis. Other *ra'aman*-trees may have been those mentioned in Hos. iv. 13.[1]

It will now be clear that instead of 'every Ra'anan (or Ra'aman) tree' the legislator might just as well have said 'every Ashḥur-tree,' for 'Ashḥur' and 'Yeraḥme'el,' as regional names, are nearly equivalent.[2] The trees referred to were perhaps trees of the hills; certainly they were trees which struck the Israelites in N. Arabia as characteristic of the land. Fitly, then, are '*ra'anan*-trees' mentioned in xii. 2, etc., beside the mountains and the hills, and fitly may we restore in xvi. 21, for אשרה כל עץ,[3] כָּל-עֵץ אֲשֵׁחַר, 'Thou shalt not plant for thyself any kind of Ashḥur-tree near the altar of Yahweh thy God which thou makest unto thyself.' There were, of course, different varieties of trees bearing this name; one of them was called *teasshur* (Isa. xli. 19, lx. 13). Specially abundant were they in the N. Arabian territory called Ephrath or Ephraim, if we are right in restoring, in Hos. xiii. 15, for the unintelligible בין אחים ('among brethren'), בין אשחרים. I do not, at any rate, know any equally good correction. The sense, 'Though he (the southern Ephraim) be fruitful among Ashḥur-trees,' is satisfactory, especially when we consider that in chap.

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 33, 457.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 23 *f.*

[3] Prof. G. F. Moore renders the MT. 'an Asherah—any kind of tree,' or 'an Asherah—any wooden object' (*E. Bib.* col. 331).

xiv. the imagery is clearly taken from the (southern) Lebanon.[1]

Here, however, it is the Ra'anan-trees which are spoken of. The name is a fresh indication of the N. Arabian origin of the popular Israelitish cult, and when in the later period there had been a fresh infusion of Arabian elements into the 'people of the land,' it is mentioned as a characteristic offence that these people carry on a sensuous cult 'under every Ra'anan-tree' (Isa. lvii. 5).

Among other directions to the faithful this may now be noticed—'ye shall destroy the names of them out of that place' (xii. 3 *b*; cp. Ex. xxiii. 13, Hos. ii. 19, Zech. xiii. 2). How well this enables us to understand the efforts of ancient redactors to conceal the titles of the great N. Arabian goddess,[2] and such transformations as שעירים, 'goats,' 'satyrs' (Lev. xvii. 7, 2 Chr. xi. 15, and [see p. 26] 2 K. xxiii. 8) from אשורים, 'images of Asshur'! The command itself can be easily explained. Altars, images, and names were thought to have magic power; hence the need for their annihilation by the enemies of the cult (cp. vii. 25, 'lest thou be ensnared thereby'). The safest course with images was to pulverise them; see the story of Moses (Ex. xxxii. 20) and of Josiah (2 K. xxiii. 4, 15, p. 22); cp. also Isa. xxx. 22, 'thou shalt scatter them.'[3]

The sanctuaries of 'the nations,' then, were to be destroyed. But where was the pious Israelite to meet his God? One answer is given in Ex. xx. 24 (see p. 105), where a wide freedom is granted. In Deuteronomy, however (xii. 5-7, 11, 13 *f.*, etc.), this earlier permission is virtually abrogated. There is only one place at which both sacrifices and dues can lawfully be offered. The name of the place is not yet to be made known, but in due time the place will be chosen, in order to become the depository of the divine 'name.' For only when this depositing of the name had taken place could there be a real cultus, by which the supernatural powers wielded by Israel's God might be attracted to earth for Israel's benefit.

[1] See *T. and B.*, pp. 456-458, where אחו is also taken to be a corruption of אשחור.

[2] See *T. and B.* pp. 18-22.

[3] See Duhm, *Jesaia*[2], p. 193.

The place would have to be chosen 'out of all your tribes'[1] (*i.e.* tribal territories), and also (see *v.* 5) on the other side of Jordan. ירדן, however, is again and again a scribal error for ירחון. In proof of this note ירדן ירחו in Num. xxii. 1 and elsewhere, which, regarded as a Hebrew phrase, is hardly defensible. As is not unfrequently the case, the error and the correction stand side by side. Probably, then, beyond this stream (the Yarḥon, or Yeraḥme'el stream)[2] lay the region in which Israelitish tribes or clans had their first settlements, the region for which the Israelites and the southern Arammites were continually striving. The place, therefore, was not Jerusalem nor yet (as A. Duff thinks)[3] the northern Shechem. True, it is just conceivable that the expression 'the place which Yahweh your God shall choose' may have been made designedly vague to permit the explanation of it as referring to Jerusalem. This, however, is not a very natural view, and will hardly satisfy a keen critic.

No other theory being forthcoming, we are compelled to be somewhat sceptical as to the correctness of the phrase. The analogy of similarly indefinite phrases in the MT. of Gen. xii. 1, xxii. 2, which cover over place-names,[4] suggests that underneath אשר יבחר there may lie concealed the name of a region or city. If we admit this suggestion, we can hardly doubt that the underlying name is אשר ירחם, 'Asshur-Yarḥam (or Yeraḥme'el).' For the prefixed מקום we may compare מ' שכם in Gen. xii. 6.[5] The view is not really difficult. Here, as so often, the text has been manipulated by a redactor. As soon as 'Asshur-Yeraḥme'el' was altered, words had to be inserted to clear up the meaning of 'which shall choose'; other alterations or insertions would also have to be made on rhetorical grounds.[6]

[1] Cp. 1 K. viii. 16, xi. 32, xiv. 21, 2 K. xxi. 7.

[2] See especially *T. and B.* pp. 228, 262, 456.

[3] *Theology and Ethics of the Hebrews* (1902), pp. 139 *f.*

[4] Gen. xii. 1 originally ran, 'Take thy way from thy land and from thy kindred to the land of Asshur-'Arāb'; xxii. 2, 'Offer him there for a burnt offering on Asshur- (or Ashḥur-) Yeraḥme'el.' See *T. and B.* pp. 219 (and note), 328.

[5] See *ibid.* p. 220.

[6] Obviously Dt. xii. 11 *a* is such an addition. Indeed the whole of xii. 8-12 might well be spared.

So, then, in the original writing, not 'the place which Yahweh your God shall choose,' but 'the place (or, sanctuary) of Asshur-Yeraḥme'el' was probably the designation of the spot at which alone sacrifices and dues (Dt. xii. 6) might legally be offered. It was also the name both of a mountain, and of a city upon the mountain (see on Dt. iii. 17). Another name for the sacred city may have been Beth-Yeraḥme'el.[1] We have seen (p. 27) that it is prominently mentioned in the account of Josiah's reformation. To this subject we shall have to return later with reference to the first of the 'concluding sections' (chap. xxvii.) of Deuteronomy.

We pass on to xiii. 6; the transition is an easy one. It has been shown already that the reformation of Josiah was specially an attack upon the cultus of Baal or Yeraḥme'el. The God of Israel (Yahweh) may have been, in a certain sense, a development of that deity, but in course of time he had risen so far above Yeraḥme'el that Israelites of the stricter school might be said to have forgotten the older God. This act of forgetting, the writers of Deuteronomy attribute also to the Israelites at large. They therefore solemnly warn their people not to fall from their high estate by going and serving other gods 'whom thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers, gods such as those of the surrounding peoples, near or far, from one end of the land to the other.' The near deities are Baal or Yeraḥme'el (regarded as a deity separate from Yahweh), Asherah, and Ashtart; the far-off ones, those of the land of Asshur in the larger sense. To these deities Israel owed no debt of gratitude. It was not any one of them who had brought the people out of the land of Miṣrim, and redeemed them from the 'territory of Arabia' (xiii. 5; see below).

And now comes an important result. The wise legislator, who cannot help sanctioning the chief popular festivals in spite of their heathen origin, and has, as far as possible, to disguise this origin, seeks the means of doing so in the traditional history of his people (xvi. 1-15). It is not here denied that the Yeraḥme'elites, from whom presumably the festivals

[1] See Judg. ix. 6, 20, where מלוא is probably a corruption of some form of ירחמאל.

were derived, and who were a cultured people, may have regarded these institutions as commemorative.[1] But the special turn given to the historical, or supposed historical, basis of the feasts by the Israelite legislator was Israelitish. To the spring festival called *pesaḥ* (which was kept by night) and the seven following days, in which only *maṣṣoth* (unleavened cakes) were eaten, he gave this explanation—that '[out of Arabian Ashḥur] Yahweh brought thee out of Miṣrim, by night' (xvi. 1).[2] Here, 'out of Arabian Ashḥur' seems to be a perfectly correct gloss on 'out of Miṣrim'; it is equivalent to 'from the territory of Arabia' in Ex. xiii. 3, in a similar context. Philologically, of course, the name *pesaḥ* has a meaning unconnected with history; it seems to denote a peculiar limping or leaping dance,[3] specially characteristic of the sanctuary at Penuel.[4] Penuel itself may have been in a N. Arabian district, but the dance was taken up by the prophets of Baal in general (1 K. xviii. 26). The sacrifice of a lamb, however, in the feast of *pesaḥ*, suggests the cultus of Ashtart.[5]

In a similar way he explains or justifies the so-called 'feast of Shabu'oth' (xvi. 9-12) as a commemoration of the time when Israel was a slave in Miṣrim. This is, of course, merely a conventional edifying suggestion (cp. v. 15, xv. 15); Shabu'oth, like the other feasts, is pre-Israelitish. How the name Shabu'oth arose is an interesting question. The seven weeks spoken of in *v.* 9 are an artificial addition, as we see from the fact that the feast which is the counterpart of Shabu'oth has no such strange prefix to the celebration. Besides, the usual plural of *shabu'a*, 'week,' is *shabu'im*. Grimme[6] connects Shabu'oth with *shab'at*, 'seven,' referring to the Seven-divinity, *i.e.* the Pleiades (Ass. *sibe*, *sibitti*). He is at any rate on the right track in supposing the current Hebrew name to be an alteration of some heathen name (cp.

[1] Cp. Winckler, *Religionsgeschichtler und geschichtlicher Orient* (1906), p. 53.

[2] *T. and B.* p. 549 (on Ex. xiii. 3-10).

[3] Cp. *E. Bib.* col. 999 (with references). Ex. xii. 13, however, alludes to the other root-meaning, viz., 'to pass over.'

[4] *T. and B.* pp. 398 *f.*

[5] Barton, *Semitic Origins*, pp. 109 *f.*

[6] *Das israelitische Pfingstfest*, etc. (1907).

below, on Sukkoth). But is it certain that the Seven-god is the Pleiades? Winckler identifies it with Nergal.[1] And even if Beersheba may mean 'the well of the Seven-god' (Winckler, Grimme), can Yehosheba mean 'Yahweh is the Seven-god' (Grimme)? That the myth of the Pleiades has had an influence on Biblical phraseology, and even narratives, may be partly granted to Winckler and Zimmern,[2] but Grimme's fresh evidence for the Pleiades in the O.T. is unconvincing. His references to the Ḥarranian Moon-Pleiades festival are more striking, though the results which he deduces from them are unsatisfactory. For my own part (in harmony with the best view of Sukkoth), I take Shabu'oth to be a deliberately altered form of Shab'ith, which appears to have been one of the titles of the goddess Ashtart.[3] I venture to think that the feast of Shabu'oth may have been of later origin than that of Sukkoth, and have been differentiated from it. We must remember that Ashtart was probably to the early Israelites, as well as to the Yeraḥme'elites at large, the most popular member of the divine duad or triad,[4] and that she was symbolised in the zodiac as an ear of corn[5] = Aram. שבלתא (cp. our Spica).

The observance of the feast of Sukkoth also has a historical basis, which he refers to the divine command, 'ye shall dwell in booths seven days . . . that your generations may know that I made the benê Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Miṣrim' (Lev. xxiii. 42 *f.*; cp. Neh. viii. 14-17). This account, though not given in Deuteronomy (see *vv.* 13-15), seems the natural complement of what Deuteronomy says of the passover. In reality, however, the feast called Sukkoth cannot have taken its name from such an accidental circumstance as that given by P. If those who in early times kept the feast did temporarily dwell in booths (in spite of Neh. viii. 17), this must have been from motives of pure convenience. It is obvious that the agricultural Yeraḥme'elites must have had

[1] Nergal as Saturn = the sun (*AOF*, iii. 266 (n. 7); cp. *Gesch. Isr.* ii. 45).

[2] Winckler, *Gesch. Isr.* ii. 83; Zimmern, *KAT*(3), p. 389. Cp. Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, pp. 114 *f.*

[3] *T. and B.* p. 18 (n. 2).

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 16 *f.*

[5] *KAT*(3), p. 428; cp. *T. and B.* p. 69.

a festival of the ingathering which was characterised as usual by orgiastic rejoicings; the deity honoured on this occasion would be Ashtart, the patroness of fruit-bearing trees. The Israelites, who were one of the less-developed branches of the Yeraḥme'elites, would naturally adopt this festival in honour of the same gracious goddess.

Thus the original Israelite feast of Sukkoth was another of those 'statutes of (the southern) Aram'[1] which the Yahwistic legislators attempted to render unobjectionable. They attempted no doubt, but with what indifferent success the indignant harangues of the prophets enable us to realise. Two experiments were tried. One was that attested by the original Deuteronomy: it was to confine, if possible, the celebration of the autumn festival to the one sanctioned temple. Another—brought to light by textual criticism—was to modify the too suggestive popular name of the festival, which seems originally to have been 'the feast of Ashkālath' (the fem. of Ashkal[2]). By Ashkālath was meant the goddess Ashtart, who had several titles, of which Ashkālath was one, and perhaps 'queen of Ishmael'[3] another. Ashkālath was probably shortened into Ashkath or Shakkath, and this, under manipulation, became first Sukkath and then Sukkoth[4] ('booths'). The place-names Salekah[5] (Salekath) and Sukkoth have in fact probably the same origin. Sukkoth-benoth, the name of a chief deity of Babel (2 K. xvii. 30) can now perhaps be more plausibly explained.[6]

It was natural (cp. 1 K. xiv. 23 *f.*) that the legislator who demanded the destruction of the *bāmōth* should also denounce the practices specially connected with the worship of Ashtart, such as the simulation of the female sex (xxii. 5;

[1] Mic. vi. 16 (revised text); see *T. and B.* p. 63 (n. 4).

[2] *T. and B.* pp. 18, 247, 315, 406.

[3] Jer. vii. 18 (revised text); see p. 72, and *T. and B.* p. 18.

[4] Hommel's idea (*Grundriss*, p. 90) that the feast-name Sukkoth is = Sakkut, a secondary name of Ninib, so that the feast of Sukkoth was originally a festival of Sakkut, is highly questionable. Sakkut is not likely to have been known in Palestine, and the presuppositions of Hommel's theory need testing.

[5] *T. and B.* p. 397.

[6] The original form would be something like Shakkath-Tēbānîth (= Ashkālath-Yithmanith). It is the N. Arabian Bābel which is meant.

see below) and the shocking usage referred to in Am. ii. 7 *b*. Similarly in xxiii. 18 *f*. (17 *f*.) Israelites of both sexes[1] are forbidden to become temple-prostitutes (*ḳedēshīm*, *ḳedēshōth*), and (as seems to have been the custom) to bring the proceeds of their occupation in payment of a vow to the treasury of the temple. One remembers that one of Josiah's violent reforming acts was to break down the houses of the *ḳedēshīm* that were by the house of Yahweh (see p. 23). But there is a phrase in our passage (xxiii. 18 *f*.) which has not, I think, yet been fully accounted for. What can possibly be the meaning of the phrase 'the price (or, fee) of a dog,' which is parallel to 'the hire (or, recompense) of a *zōnah*'? Some have supposed that 'dog' means 'servant,'[2] with the implication of fidelity, like *kalbu* in the Amarna Tablets (75. 36, etc.) in the phrase *kalbu šarri*. It is preferable, however, to take a hint from Hommel,[3] who explains *kalab* from *kalabu* (*kalibu*) as a West-Semitic loan-word in Babylonian meaning 'priest.' This is supported by a Phœn. inscription from Kition (Cooke, *Inscr.* pp. 67 *f*.). We have still, however, to account for כלבם. Granted that male prostitutes may have ranked as priests, how came כלבם to mean 'priests of a certain peculiar class'? And the answer is כלב[י]ם is a parallel formation to כמרים, which, as we have seen (p. 23, n. 4), is probably = רכמנים, 'Rakmanites,' *i.e.* 'Yeraḥme'elites.' Not only skilled priests came from the land of Yeraḥme'el, but the male prostitutes referred to in the passage before us. Apparently there was no feminine form corresponding to כלב. In xxiii. 19 the parallel to כלב is זונה, which may perhaps be used contemptuously, for it is not a technical term. It may be remarked that גרם, another technical term in the same Phœn. inscription, may possibly have come from הגרים. By a curious coincidence Ephrem the Syrian writes thus, 'It is the star-goddess who led astray her own worshippers the Ishmaelites, and into our lands is she come, whom the sons of Hagar (Arabia)

[1] Cp. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, p. 149 (n. 3).

[2] W. R. Smith approaches this view, *Rel. Sem.*(2), p. 292 (n. 2). See also Barton, *Sem. Origins*, p. 251 (n. 2), who even compares Num. xxxii. 12.

[3] *AHT*, p. 115; *Grundriss*, p. 91 (n. 2).

adore' (ii. 457).[1] Thus we see again the wide influence of the old N. Arabian religion.

In this connexion one may best refer to the somewhat obscure passage, xxii. 5. According to Driver the prohibition which it contains is peculiar to Deut.; whether that is really the case, remains to be seen. It is, at any rate, as the commentators remark, directed against simulated changes of sex, connected with the cult of Ashtart.[2] The obscurity of the Hebrew lies in a single word כלי, which cannot without arbitrariness be said to mean 'garment,' and still less a combination of objects such as dress, weapons, staff, etc.[3] With experience of new methods Dillmann would certainly have seen that כלי, nearly as כלאים in *v.* 9, comes from some form of ירחמאלי, גבר from בגד, and שמלת from ישמעאלית. There have also been two transpositions, and ילבש has come from תלבש. Thus we get לא יהיה בגד ירחמאלי על-אשה ולא תלבש בגד אשה ישמעאלית, 'The garment of a Yeraḥme'elite shall not be upon a woman, neither shalt thou put on the garment of a woman that is an Ishmaelite.'

To confirm this result let us direct our attention to xiv. 21 and xxii. 9-11. Both passages have already been explained elsewhere.[4] The former has most probably come from לא תלבש בגד ירחמאלית, 'Thou shalt not put on the garment of a Yeraḥme'elite woman.' The latter—a threefold enactment—will, in this context, reward a fuller treatment. Sorely has it perplexed interpreters. 'Why,' they ask, 'should a vineyard not be "sown with divers seed"? And why refer, in prohibitory terms, to the singular case of ploughing with an ox and an ass together? Why, too, should there be a prohibition of garments composed of linen and wool together?' A writer in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* ("Dress," § 7) suggests that the object of the law may have been to mark the distinction between the priest

[1] Quoted by Barton, *JBL* x. 81.

[2] For historical instances see Driver, *Deut.* p. 250. Reclining on Yeraḥme'elite garments is an abuse denounced from a religious motive in Am. ii. 8 (*T. and B.* p. 360, reading חמלים).

[3] See *BDB*, *s.v.* כלי.

[4] *T. and B.* pp. 565 *f.*, where Ex. xxiii. 19 and Lev. xix. 19 are also considered.

and the layman. But did the priests wear garments of the mixed material? This may be supported by Josephus (*Ant.* iv. 8, 11), but is opposed to Ezek. xlvii. 17, where it is said that "no wool shall come upon them." And can שעטנז really have been taken to mean "linen and wool"? The writer of Deut. xxii. 11 may seem indeed to have given the word this meaning, but the Sept., with its *κίβδηλον*, shows that some early students thought differently. Surely שעטנז cannot be the right reading. Nothing is gained by conjecturing that the term, and indeed the law itself, may be of foreign origin, unless some other reason than our convenience can be offered for the conjecture.'[1]

It is to the credit of two recent critics that they have made fresh attempts to account for the strange enactments in this paragraph. Comparing Isa. xvii. 10 Bertholet offers the conjecture that the legislator may here express the primitive conception that different objects belong to different religious circles, and consequently ought not to be mixed. Steuernagel, on the other hand, discovers a reference to the cultus of the powers of nature, and even perhaps to the fusion (here condemned) of two deities. Neither critic apparently has suspected the traditional text, and yet, whenever these seemingly insoluble problems of exegesis arise, it is the duty of a textual critic to search for traces of an underlying text, which a redactor received in an already corrupt form, and emended to the best of his own uncritical judgment. Now in *vv.* 9-11 there are a number of words which, at a first glance, an experienced critic would suspect to be, in their combination, corrupt, and which he would be able with some confidence to correct. Until any one proposes something better (wholly different it will hardly be), I venture to restore the text thus, לא תארש [אשה] ירחמאל׳ פן־תקדיש [ל]ירחמאל זרעך אשר תזרע ותבואתו׃ לא־תָהֹ[ג] בשור ובירחמאל׃ לא תלבש [בגד] שַׁעֲטִנִית [ב]מִצֹּר פלשתים׃ ; that is, 'Thou shalt not espouse a Yerahme'elite woman, lest thou consecrate to Yerahme'el thy seed which thou sowest and the produce thereof. Thou shalt not keep feasts in Shur (= Asshur) and in Yerahme'el. Thou shalt not clothe thee

[1] 'Some Testing Biblical Passages,' *Amer. J. of Theology*, April 1905, p. 330. רש in תחרש (xxii. 10) is a dittograph.

with the garment of a Shinarite woman in Miṣṣor of Pelishtim (Pelethim).'[1]

The easiest words to correct in the MT. are נרמך,[2] נלאים,[3] המלאה,[4] הנכרם,[5] שור,[6] חמר,[7] יחדיו,[8] צמר,[9] because experience shows that names of peoples or regions may be expected to underlie them. That ירחמאל in various forms is repeated, is a not uncommon fact; in the above restoration repetitions are neglected. That אשה has dropped out after תאורש is also not surprising; the eye would easily overlook the second occurrence of אש.

We can now see more clearly how repugnant the unreformed Yerahme'elite cultus had become to the adherents of a more progressive religion. The legislator not only forbids the evil usages in force at Yerahme'elite festivals, but also (cp. vii. 3; Josh. xxiii. 12) prohibits mixed marriages, as tending to a fusion of religious practices.[10] Now too, perhaps, we can understand better a difficult passage in Zephaniah (i. 8 *f.*). Those who are 'clothed with foreign clothing' are those who, in order to take part in N. Arabian festivals, put on special N. Arabian garments. Those who leap over the threshold are those who take part in some N. Arabian sacred dance,[11] and the house which they fill with the produce of 'violence and deceit' is some temple of Armon, *i.e.* Yerahme'el.[12]

In xviii. 10 *f.* other special 'abominations' are forbidden. One is child-sacrifice, a terrible rite, known in Canaan, but not apparently in Babylonia, and probably borrowed from

1 Or Pelishtim or Pelethim = Ethbaalim; see Introd., p. xxi.; *T. and B.* pp. 192, 312.

2 Probably from רכמן = כרמן. Cp. χαρμαν, 𝔊, Ezek. xxvii. 23, = MT. בלסר, *i.e.* ירחמאל, also נמרד, Gen. x. 8, Mic. v. 5, probably from רכמן.

3 Another corruption of ירחמאל, like מיכאל and מלאך (in 'מלאך י); also מלאים, 1 S. xv. 4, from יחמעאל (ישמ').

4 Also from ירחמאל; cp. *T. and B.* on מלא, Gen. xxiii. 9.

5 See Introd., and cp. *Crit. Bib.* on בית־הכרם, Jer. vi. 1.

6 Shortened from אשור (see Gen. xxv. 12, and cp. *T. and B.* 269).

7 A modification of ירחם (see *T. and B.* p. 32 n. 2).

8 See Isa. xxxi. 3, explained in Introd.

9 See *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. iii. 4, Ezek. xxvii. 18.

10 *T. and B.* p. 566.

11 *Ibid.* pp. 398 *f.*

12 ארניהם is probably a corruption of ארמון; cp. *T. and B.* pp. 55, 569.

N. Arabia.[1] The others are various kinds of magic and divination. That the Arabian neighbours of Israel were devoted to soothsaying is undeniable. The Ekron where Baal-zebub (Baal of Ishmael) gave oracles to his worshippers (2 K. i. 2) was probably in N. Arabia.[2] Isa. ii. 6 has already been referred to. Lastly, in the original form of the story of Bil'am it is plain that he was regarded as a N. Arabian soothsayer, skilled beyond others in the use of spells.[3]

One of the technical terms for magicians and sorcerers in xviii. 11 is שֹׁאֵל אוֹב יִדְּעֹנִי. Here again it is difficult to be satisfied with the general attitude of scholars. Does אוֹב really mean 'a bottle,' or 'a hollow cavern,' or a *revenant*? Or is it, as Schwally thinks, connected with אָב, 'father,' the plural being אבות? And does ידעני really signify 'a very knowing one'? The sense indeed is plausible, but how, if we adopt it, are the two technical terms for superhuman, oracle-giving spirits to be distinguished? 'It is hard,' remarks a writer in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (col. 1121), 'to establish the distinctions offered by Robertson Smith and Driver, the data for forming a judgment being so slight.' Let us see if the problem admits of a clearer solution than has yet been proposed.

The facts are well set forth by Driver;[4] it is needless to repeat them at length. Some modifications, however, seem required in deference to textual criticism. I begin by remarking that we must not infer, either from the list of terms in xviii. 11 (where 'one that consults the dead' follows 'one that asks an *ob* or a *yidde'oni*), or from Isa. viii. 19 ('that chirp and that mutter') and xxix. 4 ('thou shalt speak out of the earth,' etc.), that *ob* and *yidde'oni* mean spirits of the dead. It should be noticed that in Isa. xix. 3 the list of the givers of oracles opens with אלילים and closes with ידעונים, and that in the same passage, and there only, we find mention of the so-called אטים. Now Isa. xix., as can be shown, in the original underlying text,

[1] *T. and B.* p. 52; *KAT*[3], p. 599; Vincent, *Canaan*, pp. 188 *f.*, cp. 194. [2] *T. and B.* p. 109; *Crit. Bib.* p. 353.
[3] *T. and B.* pp. 40 (n. 3), 41, 190.
[4] *Deuteronomy*, pp. 225 *f.*

relates, not to Miṣraim (Egypt), but to Miṣrim (the N. Arabian Muṣri), and the land of Miṣrim was regarded as a Yeraḥme'elite region.[1] We ought not, then, to be surprised if the givers of oracles in this land bear Yeraḥme'elite names. For instance, it is probable that אטים comes from אתבעלים (Ethbaalites = Ishmaelites), especially as אט in 1 K. xxi. 27 and Hos. xi. 4 has been shown[2] to come most probably from אתבעל. Next, as to אלילים. It is hardly less probable (as has also been shown) that this word (certainly neither from אֵל, nor = Ass. *alâlu*, 'weak') is a shortened form for ירחמאלים, in the sense of 'images of Yeraḥme'el.' And is it not equally reasonable to look for a N. Arabian origin for אבות and ידענים? (*a*) For the former we may take a hint from the אב and אבי in proper names, which, as has been shown, most probably come from אבר = עבר = עֲרַב.[3] In short, אבות means, probably, neither 'ventriloquists,' nor '*revenants*,' nor 'fathers,' but 'images of Ashtart'; אַרְבִּית or rather עַרְבִּית is probably the original form both of אב (properly אב׳) and of אבות; עַרְבִּית is a title of the great N. Arabian goddess.[4] (*b*) For the latter we may most reasonably assume an original form יראנים (cp. ארן and ענר, which have the same origin) = ירחמאלם, in the sense of 'images of Yeraḥme'el' (like אלילים). These two terms, then, refer to the god Yeraḥme'el and his consort, who were regarded (as Isa. viii. 19, xxix. 4 show) as oracle-giving deities of the under-world. It was by means of images (probably rude enough) of these deities that necromancers undertook to consult the spirits of deceased persons. It should be noticed in this connexion that in 2 K. xxiii. 24 אבות and ידענים are combined with תרפים; now *teraphim*, as 1 Sam. xix. 13 shows, were images, and, as we learn from Ezek. xxi. 6 and Zech. x. 2, were reputed to give oracles to those who consulted them. Also that in 1 Sam. xxviii. 7 the phrase אשת בעלת אוב most probably means, not 'a woman who (through a spell) can command a

[1] *T. and B.* p. 32 (n. 2).
[2] *Ibid.* p. 406.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 286.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 19 (n. 6).
[5] Staerk (*Das Deuteronomium*, 1894, p. 96, n. 1) has already suggested that *'oboth* and *yidde'onim* may represent images used in the cultus.

familiar spirit,' but 'a woman of (=devoted to) the Baalah of Arabia' (אוב or אב representing עֲרָב). In such a passage, however, as Isa. xxix. 4 אוב represents not עֲרָב, but עַרְבִּית, 'the Arabian goddess' or 'an image of the goddess.'

The repugnance to Yeraḥme'elite religion which had sprung up among Yahweh-worshippers appears, if I am not mistaken, in the underlying text of xxiii. 2 (1). I do not agree with the commentators that the reference of the legislator is to two surgical operations producing the condition of a eunuch. The context makes it much more probable that some ethnic or ethnics originally stood in the text. Considering a number of textual parallels elsewhere, and also the writer's preoccupation with N. Arabian divination, it can hardly be difficult to approximate to the original text. It is probably best to read the opening words thus—צֹפֶה רקם ומכשף כורת וגו׳, *i.e.* 'A seer of Reḳem and a sorcerer of Koreth (shall not enter into Yahweh's community).' Reḳem is a frequent corruption of Yarḥam,[1] and Kōreth (like Kerîth, 1 K. xvii. 3) comes from the regional name Ashḥōreth.[2]

This result may inspire us with the hope of recovering the true text of *v.* 3 (2). 'A bastard shall not enter' is surely incorrect; ממזר, so long a subject of controversy,[3] ought to be a corruption of some well-known ethnic. The nearest as regards the component letters is זמרי, which occurs in Jer. xxv. 25, and (from its position in the list)[4] is evidently an Arabian ethnic; it is also the name of an usurper of the throne of Israel (1 K. xvi. 9), probably of N. Arabian origin. A collateral form זמרן occurs in Gen. xxv. 2. I have elsewhere[5] expressed the opinion that the

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 51, 286, 308, 370.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 23, 46, 213.

[3] See *E. Bib.*, 'Mamzer' (col. 2916).

[4] It occurs between 'Arāb (so read *twice* in *v.* 24) and 'Elam—a shortened form of Ishmael or Yeraḥme'el (see Ezra ii. 7, 31 = Neh. vii. 12, 34). See *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*

[5] *E. Bib.* col. 2916; cp. Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 90 *f.*; Bertholet, *Stellung*, pp. 142 *ff.*, and *Deut.* p. 71. Kennett, however (*Journ. of Theol. Studies*, July 1906, p. 487), rashly infers from *vv.* 4 *ff.* that Deut. was probably composed later than the destruction of Jerusalem.

whole passage xxiii. 2 *ff.* must be post-exilic. I would now add that while Neh. xiii. 1-3 distinctly connects Dt. xxiii. 4-6 with the age of Nehemiah, it is quite possible that the passage may have been worked over or expanded. But however this may be, it seems clear that a connexion is presupposed between Israel and the N. Arabians, 'Pethor' being a distortion of 'Pathros[1] (the traditional reading of the word), *i.e.* probably Ṣarephath.

We have seen already that the Deuteronomist takes an interest in traditional history. Thus, in xxv. 17-19 he refers to the feud between Israel and Amalek. The Amalekites (a backward branch of the great Yeraḥme'elite race)[2] are accused here, not of worshipping God in improper ways, but of altogether rejecting the true 'fear of God' by attacking the feeble Israelites who were in the rear of the post (cp. Ex. xvii. 8). The passage begins with the emphatic admonition, 'Remember what Amalek did to thee by the way, when ye had come forth out of Miṣrim.' It is very singular that in xxiv. 9 the same form of phrase occurs, though with some difference in the historical reference. The traditional text reads thus, 'Remember what Yahweh thy God did to Miriam by the way, after that ye had come forth out of Miṣrim.' The allusion seemingly is to Num. xii., where Miriam is struck with leprosy for seven days, as a punishment for the lead she had taken in mutinous speeches against Moses. But has the original text come down to us unaltered? A prefixed passage (*v.* 8) contains a warning to Israel to attend carefully to the authorised exponents of the law in the difficulties arising out of a case of leprosy. How is this warning made more effectual by a reference to the exclusion of Miriam from the camp for seven days? The answer is that the admonition gains nothing in force by such a reference, and we are further driven to the assumption that either *v.* 8 or *v.* 9 is a later insertion, the remedy suggested by Steuernagel[3] being both

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 40 (n. 3), 189 *f.*

[2] *Ibid.* pp. xiii, 562.

[3] This scholar reduces the exhortation to the words, 'Take heed in the plague of leprosy. Remember what Yahweh thy God did to Miriam.'

insufficient and too arbitrary. We can hardly doubt that the later addition is *v.* 8. If such an important subject as the 'plague of leprosy' were referred to at all, it would not be in such brief and uninstructive expressions as we find in *v.* 8.

But why, then, was the addition made? We shall only be able to answer when we have examined the text of *v.* 9. An isolated and obscure reference to Miriam is most improbable. The obscurity of it must soon have been felt, and this accounts for the prefixing of *v.* 8, which represents an early but a vain attempt to throw light on the passage. Taking this improbability, together with the parallelism in form between xxiv. 9 and xxv. 17, we cannot but conclude that 'Miriam' is wrong, and, if so, that 'Yahweh thy God' is also wrong. מרים, like ממרא[1] (Gen. xiii. 18), probably comes from ראמן (= ירחמאל), a gloss on the עמלק underlying אלהיך, while יהוה is a redactional insertion, and ל (in למרים) comes from לך. Thus we get an exact parallel to xxv. 17, which one cannot help thinking must have been misplaced—'Remember what Amalek (*gloss*, 'Ra'aman) did unto thee in the way, when ye had come forth out of Miṣrim.'

It may be helpful to add in passing that the improbable words in Mic. vi. 4 *b*, 'and I sent (ואשלח) before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam,' should probably be, 'and I overcame (וָאַחֲלֹשׁ) before thee Ishmael, Ashḥur, and Aram';[2] also that in Num. xx. 10, 'Hear now, ye rebels (המרים),' should probably be, 'Hear now, ye Aramæans (הארמים).' Until some better corrections of the texts can be offered, I venture to adhere to these not unreasonable suggestions. Those who defend the originality of the text of Dt. xxiv. 9 have to explain why the severe punishment of the sister of Aaron should be referred to as a reason for obeying the injunctions of the priests concerning leprosy.

Whether the admonition respecting Amalek formed part of the original book seems to me very doubtful. It may perhaps more naturally be regarded as an early appendix. Another appendix we may reasonably find in chap. xxvi. In *vv.* 1-15 we have an account of two

[1] *T. and B.* p. 229. [2] Cp. *E. Bib.* col. 3073 (n. 2).

liturgical ceremonies to be performed by the Israelite in Canaan, and of the forms of prayer and profession. In one of these forms (*v.* 5) occurs the remarkable statement that the father of the people was 'a wandering Aramæan' (ארמי אבד). The phrase represents the earliest tradition, according to which Jacob was an Aramæan or Yerahme'elite of N. Arabia. The pointed text adds that he 'went down into Miṣraim and sojourned there (consisting?) in a few men, and became a nation, great, mighty, and populous.' But במתי מעט, 'in a few men,' is most improbable. The idiom is not free from harshness, and if it means that the descendants of Jacob who went down into Egypt (?) were but few in number, it adds nothing to the force of the statement. Indeed, if we omit it, the effect of the passage is heightened. But now call in the aid of textual criticism as applied elsewhere, and the troublesome words can at once be accounted for. The dropping of a letter of a word is common; assume, therefore, that מתי comes from תמול (י and ו confounded), which, like אתמול, repeatedly (*e.g.* Isa. xxx. 33) stands for ישמעאל. Assume, too, that מעט comes from מענת (see my note on במעט, Ps. cv. 12, in *Psalms*, 2nd ed.). We then get 'in Ishmael-Maakath,' which is a suitable geographical gloss on 'in Miṣrim.' In fact, it was in the N. Arabian land of Miṣrim that the Israelites (or their ancestors) sojourned (see *T. and B.* pp. xviii-xix, 545-547, etc.).

One more possible reference to Miṣrim still deserves our attention. It is contained in the law of the king in xvii. 14-20. Probably the whole passage is a later insertion;[1] *vv.* 18-20, at any rate, plainly belong to the post-exilic period. But, whenever it was written, it was still remembered (see *v.* 15) that foreign soldiers of fortune[2] had forced their way to the throne of Israel. *V.* 16 has evidently received interpolations.[3] In its original form it ran, 'But he shall not get for himself many horses (or,

[1] On the date cp. Bertholet, *Deut.* p. 55; Cornill, *Introd.* p. 55.

[2] *E.g.* Zimri, Tibni, Omri. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Tibni.'

[3] Erbt (*Die Hebräer*, p. 169, n. 1) takes 'in order to multiply horses' to be interpolated; Steuernagel would omit *v.* 16*b*. Both scholars seem to be right.

Ishmaelites?), and so cause the people to return to Miṣrim.' The latter words are to be illustrated by Hos. xi. 5, where we should read, 'He shall return to the land of Miṣrim,' *i.e.* he shall be brought thither as a captive; both in Deuteronomy and in Hosea it is the punishment of Israel that is referred to. With regard to the 'getting many horses' it is certainly not impossible that horses may have been procured from Miṣrim in N. Arabia,[1] and it is certain that trust in horses, or fear of horses, in warfare is condemned in several O.T. passages (*e.g.* Dt. xx. 1). It is also possible, however, that the reference to horses is due to a misunderstanding. Again and again (*e.g.* Isa. lxvi. 20) סוסים appears to be a popular corruption of ישמעאלים[2] (through סמסים). This may perhaps be the case here. If the underlying text of 1 K. v. 6, x. 26, has been correctly determined,[3] Solomon had a small standing army of N. Arabians. There may be a reference to this, supposing that the writer had before him a correct text of Kings; there is certainly a reference to Solomon's polygamy in *v.* 17. If so, the legislator may mean that any king of Israel who collects such an army does it at his own peril. His punishment will be a second captivity and oppression of his people in the land of Miṣrim.

Some further notice, however, is due to the expressions used in *v.* 16 *b*. The interpolator (as one must think) refers to a 'word' of Yahweh to the effect that Israel shall not have to return that way (*i.e.* to Miṣrim). Such a word or promise it would be difficult to find. Are we to suppose that it once existed in some generally known record? Or does the interpolation refer to the already corrupted text of Hos. xi. 5 (see above), 'he shall not return to the land of Miṣrim'? The latter seems the more natural view. The interpolator looked at these words by themselves, and regarded them as a divine word of promise.

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 462-464.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 488 (n. 2); note remark on סמסי, 1 Chr. ii. 40.

[3] See *Crit. Bib.* pp. 320 (top), 333, but note that on p. 320 סוסים should have been traced to סמסים. David, indeed, had also a similar standing army or guard—the so-called Kerethites (Ashḥartites) and Pelethites (Ethbaalites).

We have now completed the most important part of our search, and found abundant evidence of the N. Arabian atmosphere of the original Deuteronomy. The legislation in chaps. xii.-xxvi. is largely directed against Yeraḥme'elite or N. Arabian practices dangerous to adherents of the pure religion of Yahweh, and the law of the One Sanctuary is framed in the interest of a temple which, while religiously separate from the impurities of N. Arabian worship, is nevertheless, geographically speaking, Yeraḥme'elite. The persons, too, who are addressed are commanded to keep aloof from the 'statutes of the Aramæan' (as a prophetic writer calls the N. Arabian usages),[1] and yet they had to declare most solemnly (xxvi. 5) that their great ancestor Jacob had been 'a wandering Aramæan,' *i.e.* a Yeraḥme'elite.

It must now be clear to demonstration that such a law-book as chaps. xii.-xxvi. (putting aside the question as to interpolations or later additions) was in urgent need of adaptation before it could be deposited and subsequently 'found' in the royal temple of Jerusalem. With great redactional skill the references to N. Arabia have been, for the most part, emended out of existence. That lexicographical and exegetical difficulties have been created thereby cannot, however, be denied, and it is the study of these problems in the light of a theory that has helped us in our need elsewhere which has enabled us to solve them more adequately than has yet perhaps been possible.

Besides these verbal and phraseological alterations, the law-book referred to needed an introduction and a conclusion. The terror excited in Josiah (as the well-known narrative states) by the reading of 'this book' (2 K. xxiii. 11-13) or, at any rate, in other persons, when they read it for the first time, and the references (*vv.* 16, 19) to the grievous fate announced in the book for Jerusalem and its inhabitants, suggest that it contained, not only laws, but extremely solemn curses on the people in the event of their disobedience. Such curses would naturally form part of the conclusion, though it is impossible to point them out in the present Deuteronomy. The introduction would as naturally

[1] Mic. vi. 16; see *T. and B.* p. 63 (n. 4).

give a statement of the situation of the Israelites immediately before the crossing of the border-stream ; the speaker would, of course, be Moses. We cannot, however, attempt to recover this preamble either from chaps. i.-iv. 43, or from the second portion of the existing introduction of Deuteronomy, chaps. iv. 44-xi.

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST PREAMBLE (I. 1–IV. 43)

IN spite of what has just now been said, we are compelled to scrutinise closely the existing introduction and conclusion (in their different parts). Our object is, not to detect the original preamble, but to find any possible or probable references to N. Arabia. Here, too, it is not impossible that references may occur to an early tradition of the N. Arabian residence of the Israelitish clans. Such references are not unlikely to occur in passages which contain some strange verbal or phraseological difficulties. And behold, such difficulties actually meet us in the very first verses of the first chapter. 'Terribly corrupt,' is Cornill's verdict on i. 1, 2. But ought we to sit down, cowed by such a remark? I think not. בעבר הירדן ceases to puzzle us[1] when we see that ירדן in the early traditions is repeatedly miswritten for יַרְדֵּן,[2] a border-stream (as exegesis leads us to assume) in N. Arabia. It now at once becomes probable that the עבר of the text (like the עבר of Gen. x. 21, 24 *f.*) has arisen out of עֲרָב, 'Arabia.'[3]

Let us now proceed hopefully to the hard problems which follow. And first we notice (still in *v.* 1) the words במדבר בערבה מול. Why should not ערבה be miswritten for עֲרָב (as in xi. 30, Josh. xii. 3?), and מול be a shortened form of ישמעאל or ירחמאל (as in iii. 29, iv. 46, xxxiv. 6?)? For the latter, cp. אתמול from אתמעל (cp. on מתי, xxvi. 5). If so, we shall get the phrase בַּעֲרָב ירחמ', 'in Yeraḥme'elite

[1] Sometimes this phrase is supposed to refer to the east, sometimes to the west, of the river Jordan.

[2] See *T. and B.* p. 229.

[3] So presumably often elsewhere.

Arabia.' מדבר may perhaps be misplaced, and stand properly before סוף, a word which, like the feminine form סופה (Num. xxi. 14), probably comes from ספר (in קרית ספר), the feminine form of which (סְפָרַת) occurs in Ezra ii. 55 (= Neh. vii. 57), and may be identical with צרפת.[1] Then follows a group of names, mostly difficult. The origin of פארן is treated elsewhere.[2] Note here that in xxxiii. 2, 'the mountain-country of Paran' and 'Merîbah in Ḳadesh' are parallel. Paran, therefore, was at any rate in the Yeraḥme'elite region. תפל is not = eṭ-Ṭafile in N. Edom, but identical with פלת = תבל = אתבעל.[3] לבן (which has nothing to do with moon-worship) is, both as a tribal and as a place name, of S. Aramæan origin.[4] חצרת has sprung from אַשְׁחֹרֶת, a feminine form of the regional name אשחר.[5] די זהב (𝔊, Καταχρύσεα) is, of course, parallel to the strange-looking name מִי זָהָב[6] (as if 'waters of gold' in Gen. xxxvi. 39), and also to דנהבה[7] (Gen. xxxvi. 32). זהב seems ultimately to come from ישמעאל;[8] די or דן and מי should be corrupt fragments of some ethnic or regional name such as ארן or ארם.

V. 2 in the traditional text runs thus, 'There are eleven days' (journey) from Horeb by the road to mount Seir to Ḳadesh-barnea.' But is it in the least probable that the preamble of our Deuteronomy should contain a statement of the distance from Horeb to the so-called Ḳadesh-barnea?' Considering how often numerals cover over ethnic or regional names, and how often י[ו]ם stands for ימן, which again and again (through יחמן or ישמן) represents either ירחמאל or its equivalent ישמעאל,[9] should we not for אחד עשר יום restore יָמָן [אַשֻּׁר] אִשְׁחֹר?[10] One may venture to add the conjecture that ברנע in קדש ב׳ (Ḳadesh-barnea) comes from רעבן (cp.

[1] *T. and B.* p. 551. [2] *Ibid.* p. 242.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 161, 312 (n. 2). Cp. צבעין = צפון (*ibid.* p. 50, n. 3).
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 123, 345. [5] *Ibid.* pp. 23, 319.
[6] Sayce, letter in *Academy*, October 22, 1892; Marquart, *Fundamente*, p. 10.
[7] *T. and B.* p. 430. [8] *Ibid.* p. 433.
[9] *Ibid.* pp. 6 (n. 3), 161.
[10] Note that אחר and עשר are here taken as representatives of אַשְׁחֹר and אַשֻּׁר respectively. Ashḥur and Asshur, of course, are alternative forms, but Ashḥur is to be preferred.

ראובן), a corruption of רעמן, *i.e.* ירחמאל. Such corruptions abound; the true meaning of the names was, of course, forgotten.

What, then, is the origin of *vv.* 1 and 2? How has the present text grown up, assuming the textual corrections suggested above? 'These are the words which Moses spoke to all Israel'—that this is the true beginning of the little superscription cannot be questioned. But where did he speak them? This had to be stated, but it is difficult to make out exactly what the redactor said. Probably it was בערב הירדן, 'in Arabia of the Yarḥon,' and as a gloss upon this a scribe added ירחמאל בַּעֲרָב, 'in Arabia of Yeraḥme'el,' and again במדבר סופרת, 'in the wilderness of Sophereth[1] (= Ṣarephath).' Some other late scribe, who had access to lists of names, inserted 'between Paran, and Tophel (= Ethbaal), and Laban, and Haṣeroth (= Ashḥoreth), and Aram-Ishmael.' For these names it would have been much simpler to give the well-known compound name, Asshur- or Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el. So thought the ancient scholar who inserted the name which, in a highly corrupt form, has become 'eleven days.' This final misreading was perhaps facilitated by an accident. A few words, which may have been meant as a gloss on 'Turn you and take your journey' in *v.* 7, found their way (as is often the case) into the text in a most inappropriate place. The words are 'from Horeb towards mount Seir as far as Kadesh-barnea (Ra'aman).'

Verse 5 is at first sight a second version of *v.* 1 *a*. The truth is, however, that the compound verbal phrase הועיל באר is corrupt, so that *v.* 5 is no sentence at all. Natural the phrase rendered 'undertook to explain' certainly is not, and the existence of a word באר, 'to explain,' is extremely doubtful.[2] With so many analogous cases before us we can hardly help restoring יְרַחְמְאֵל עֲרָב,[3] on which בארץ מואב may be a (possibly incorrect) gloss. The words משה

[1] Neh. vii. 57; cp. *T. and B.* p. 382.

[2] In xxvii. 8, Hab. ii. 2 (the only other passages where באר occurs), באר can be shown to be corrupt, and in Hab. *l.c.* to have most probably originated in עֲרָב. (Cp. also רבאר, xxxiii. 25 *b*, from בַּעֲרָב.)

[3] הועיל probably from ירחמאל, sometimes with לא prefixed (redactionally?) as in Jer. ii. 11.

את־התורה הזאת לאמר may be due to a redactor who had before him ill-written words (which really constitute glosses), of which he could make nothing without conjecture. ירחמ׳ ערב is itself, presumably, a gloss, which may very possibly be intended to state that the kingdoms of Sihon and Og were in 'Arabian Yeraḥme'el.'

The speech of Moses is retrospective. It begins with a version of a divine command to the Israelites to journey on from Horeb to the promised land (i. 6-8). This region is represented as in Arabia. Using results arrived at elsewhere (see references below), we find it described as embracing the land of the Canaanite, and (the southern) Lebanon, while the farthest limit (עד) of the region was, not 'the great river the river Euphrates,' but 'the river of Gilead, the river of Perāth (*i.e.* Ephrāth).' Between 'the hill-country of the Amorite' and 'the land of the Canaanite' comes a list of districts which adjoin the 'Amorites,' and are 'in Arabia (read בָּעֲרָבָה), in the mountains, in the Shephelah [in the Negeb], and in Reḥob-Yaman.' In the parallel passage, Josh. ix. 1, the Negeb is not mentioned; perhaps it is here only by accident. How far the geographical names in this and similar lists represent separate regions, we cannot say. One or two remarks may be added. That 'Amorites' means properly 'highlanders' and 'Canaanites' means 'lowlanders' is a pure imagination. The two designations may quite well be synonymous (see on ix. 1 *f.*). See, further, *T. and B.* pp. 195, 174 *f.*; on the southern Lebanon, *ibid.* p. 457; on the southern streams, *ibid.* pp. 262 *f.* (cp. 91); and on Reḥob-Yaman, *ibid.* pp. 498, 504.

Passing over matters more fitly treated elsewhere, I stop next at ii. 10-12, which is rightly regarded by Steuernagel as a later insertion. Such antiquarian notices are absurdly unsuitable in the mouth of the divine Speaker. Nor is the annotator's accuracy by any means beyond reproach. The Emim (*T. and B.*, p. 241) and the Anaḳim (*ibid.* p. 121) are both Yeraḥme'elite peoples, and therefore akin to the Israelites; and the Ḥorites are not cave-dwellers, but simply a branch of the Asshurites (*ibid.* pp. 241, 424). That the Ḥorites were destroyed by the benê Esau may be

a purely gratuitous statement, based, perhaps, on the corrupt reading ישבי הארץ in Gen. xxxvi. 20 (*T. and B.* p. 425 *f.*). That they dwelt in Seir is probably correct, and from Gen. xxvi. 34, if rightly read (in *T. and B.* p. 364), it appears that Esau's first wife was a Ḥorite. For the Rephaim see on iii. 11. That 'Rephaim' means 'giants' is of course wrong, though the tall stature of the earlier masters of Canaan certainly formed part of Israelitish folklore (Num. xiii. 33, Am. ii. 9).

Another late antiquarian notice has to be considered. But first let us seek to illuminate a somewhat obscure passage which precedes it. In ii. 18 we read, 'Thou art now about to pass through the region of Moab, Ar.' To suppose that there was a district dominated by the city of Ar, would be hazardous. It will be observed that in *vv.* 9, 18, and 29 (B, however, in 9, 18, gives Σηειρ), 𝔊 has Αροηρ (but A in 29, Αροηλ). Now ערוער (Αροηρ) is most probably a compound name. ערו, like רעו (see *T. and B.* p. 210), may represent ירחמאל, and ער come from עֶרֶב. In Isa. xvii. 2 ערוער actually appears as the name of a district. Here, too, it is best to take it so, and also in *vv.* 9, 29, *i.e.* as a symbol for Yeraḥme'el-Arāb.

The antiquarian notice is in ii. 20-23. It relates to the former inhabitants of the land of the benê Ammon. This land, too (cp. *v.* 11), was formerly inhabited by Rephaim, a people whom the Ammonites called 'Zamzummim.' This strange-looking word has provoked much learned speculation. Robertson Smith, following Schwally, explains it from the Arabic as meaning 'whisperers, murmurers.'[1] This, however, is almost on a par with the explanation of Emim (*v.* 10, Gen. xiv. 5) as 'terrible ones,' which is plainly not the original meaning of an ethnic name. זם is possibly, like שם and שן, a corrupt fragment of ישמן = ישמעאל. For the reduplication cp. סנסנה, Josh. xv. 31. ז for ש, as in זבול and זבוב from ישמעאל. In short, the Zamzummim, like the Zuzim,[2] are a branch of the Ishmaelites, and why should we suppose that the Arammites who overcame them were a younger race? As for the עוים (Avvites), for whom 𝔊 substitutes the Ḥivvites, and the

[1] MS. note quoted by Driver, *Deut.* p. 40.

[2] Gen. xiv. 5. See *T. and B.* p. 241.

Kaphtorim, we cannot speak quite so confidently. The former may be a tribe of Arabians (ערבים). They are generally supposed to have dwelt, according to the Hebrew text, in villages, but surely the parallelism of *vv.* 10, 12, 20, 22, favours the view that חצרים represents a proper name. חצר is the name required; it was wrongly supposed to be the short for חצרים. חצר, like זרח, is most probably a distortion of אשחר. It is noteworthy that $\mathfrak{G}^{B}$ has $A\sigma\eta\delta\omega\theta$, *i.e.* אשדות, which (see on iii. 17) certainly comes from אשתר (= אשחר).

As for the latter, it should, I think, be clear that 'the Kaphtorim who came out from Kaphtor' is very improbable. Kaphtorim would indeed be a most misleading name for *emigrants* from Kaphtor. The name we should expect is פלתים (often confounded with פלשתים). According to the (probably) best reading in Gen. x. 14, the Pelethites came forth from Kaphtor, or perhaps rather (see *T. and B.* p. 192) Rehoboth. Pelethim and Kaphtorim, it is true, are far apart, but כפתרים was probably corrupted from פתרסים[1] (M.T., Pathrusim, Gen. x. 14), or, strictly, צרפתים. That צרף (= סרף or ספר) is a clan-name is indisputable.

The account of the destruction of the peoples of Sihon and Og needs critical comment. The geography of the original traditions worked up in ii. 24-iii. 11 may have been different from that of the final redactor. Certainly this is suggested by the names. 'Amorites' is scarcely different from 'Arammites,' and it must be admitted that there was a southern Aram. 'Heshbon' is a name which may have attached itself to different localities, for חשב and חשם are virtually identical, and the origin given elsewhere[2] to חמשים in Ex. xiii. 18 and other passages may be given with almost equal justice to חשבון. 'Bashan' (as numerous analogies suggest) comes from 'Abshan,' *i.e.* Arab-Ishmael. 'Ashtaroth,' or better 'Ashtereth' (*i.e.* Ashtart), is at least very suggestive of N. Arabia (see *T. and B.* pp. 240 *f.*). Here, indeed, the residence of Og is further defined as being 'in Edrei'; the view that 'and' should be prefixed, so that Og

[1] כ and ם confounded, as in 1 K. vii. 40 (cp. *v.* 43) כירות stands for סירות.

[2] *T. and B.* pp. 489, 552.

will have had two royal cities, though quite defensible (see 𝔊, Vg., and cp. Driver), is at any rate improbable. The truth may be that אדרעי is miswritten for some form like ערוער, which, as we have seen, may represent עֲרַב ירחמאל.[1] The name סיחון in its present form is inexplicable; סרחון would give a clear meaning, for חרם is a corruption of אשחר. עוג, too, as it stands, is obscure; but it is not impossible that, like גוג and מגוג, it may ultimately come from some form of ירחמאל.[2]

Some names still remain. ארנון (ii. 36) represents ראמן; cp. רענן (see above, on xii. 2). On the problem of the name 'Gilead' see *T. and B.*, p. 389, in connection with the great legendary compact between Jacob and Laban. 'Salecah' (סלכה) iii. 10, Josh. xii. 5, xiii. 11, is a very old commercial centre, mentioned also in Genesis as N. Arabian.[3] The money standard established by its merchants was probably accepted both in the N. Arabian border-land and in the land of Judah, for we find the phrase 'the shekel of Salekath' in the earlier text which underlies the MT. of Gen. xx. 16. סלכה may come from אשכל, and thereby be distinguished as an Ashkalite settlement (*T. and B.* p. 315).

In the MT. of iii. 4 *b* the extent of Og's kingdom 'in Bashan' is described as 'sixty cities, all the region (?) of Argob.' Here, however, there are several problems. First, as to the 'sixty cities.' This, of course, is to be taken with Judg. x. 4, where Yair the Gileadite is said to have had thirty sons who rode on thirty ass-colts and had thirty cities. It is hard to read this without suspicion of error, and having found that ethnics are very prone to be transformed into numerals, and that עיר has often possibly come from עֲרַב, we shall do best to correct שִׁשִּׁים עיר into יִשְׁמַן עֲרַב (= Ishmael of Arabia).[4] Next, as to כל חבל ארגב. I have already attached a query to 'region,' which the lexicons with one accord give as the meaning of חבל. Unfortunately the passages containing חבל are not free from suspicion, and

[1] Cp. *T. and B.* p. 421, where it would be simpler to say that ערר comes from ערוער.

[2] *T. and B.* pp. 158 *f.*

[3] See *T. and B.* pp. 315-317, 406 *f.*, 409.

[4] See *Crit. Bib.* on Josh. xiii. 30.

here at any rate (comparing בגדים חבלים[1] in Am. ii. 8) we should read חמל, a shortened form of ירחמאל. That ארגב means 'stony,' and that such a name points to the *Leja*, is with much learning denied by Driver (p. 49). It is, however, a regional name, and should be grouped with ארגמן,[2] רגם in רגם מלך, and רגלים, all of which point to ירחמאל. It is probable that חבל (חמל) is a term of wider reference than ארגב (ארחם). The origin of both names was no doubt early forgotten.

It is an important geographical note that we find in iii. 9. (1) As to שְׂנִיר. That Saniru was the name of a mountain at the entrance of (the northern) Lebanon, we know from Shalmaneser (Del., *Paradies*, p. 104). All the other O.T. passages, however, in which שניר occurs point rather to N. Arabia (see 1 Chr. v. 23, Ezek. xxvii. 5, Cant. iv. 8). It is the first of these passages which throws most light on שניר, and confirms the view suggested by the general scenery of Deut. rightly understood, viz., that the mountain or mountain-range referred to in iii. 8 is in the N. Arabian border-land. In its original form it may have run thus—'The men of the half-tribe of Manasseh dwelt in the land from Bashan (Abshan) to Baal-Ḥermon [Senir and the Hermon range signify Yeraḥme'el].' In this rendering of the revised text I have provisionally left 'Senir.' Most probably, however, שְׂנִיר is miswritten for שנער, *i.e.* ערב ישמעאל. 'Shinar' and 'mount Hermon' are therefore naturally put together (as in Cant. iv. 8), for 'Ishmael' and 'Yeraḥme'el' (here represented by 'Hermon') are synonymous. (2) With regard to חֶרְמוֹן. The name thus read may no doubt have suggested the idea of sacredness, just as Montserrat, properly 'mons serratus,' suggested to Catalans the interpretation 'mons sacratus.' But originally Ḥermon was formed from ירחם = רחם (ירחמאל); originally, too, it designated a mountain-range in the Yeraḥme'elite country. This throws light on Enoch vi. 6, where the fallen angels, who bear

[1] Interpret thus, 'that recline on Yeraḥme'elite garments by every altar.' Cp. *T. and B.* p. 360.

[2] Purple was the dress of Midianite chiefs (Judg. viii. 26), and blue-purple and red-purple came from Ishmaelite Arabia (Ezek. xxvii. 7; see *T. and B.* pp. 165, 360).

Yeraḥme'elite names, are made to descend on Mt. Hermon. Cp. also the *αρμαγεδων* of Rev. xvi. 6; *αρμ.* = הר מגרון = הר ירח'. (3) As to שִׂרְיֹן (שִׂרְיוֹן). The name does not occur in Ass. inscriptions. Probably, like שניר, it has grown out of שנער, and has the same meaning. If so, *v.* 9 merely tells us that the 'Miṣrites' (read מִצְרִים) and the 'Arammites' (read הָאֲרַמִּי) used different forms of the same name. The alternative is to take at any rate שריון as = ישרון = אַשֶּׁרוֹן or אַשָּׁרָן. 𝔊 renders שריון in Ps. xxix. 6 by *ὁ ἠγαπήμενος* = ישרון (see on xxxii. 15). (4) In iv. 48 שרין is corrupted into שיאן.

We now return to royal Og. A strange note about him is inserted (*v.* 11). (1) Can we accept its contents? Were the Rephaim really of an older race which became extinct at the Israelitish conquest? Was the name originally an ethnic? Various theories have been broached (see *E. Bib.*, 'Rephaim'), but the view which seems to me to accord best with textual phenomena is that רפאים and אפרים both have the same origin, viz. either ערבים or (better) עֲרַב ימן, 'Yamanite Arabia.'[1] (2) May we regard the story of Og's enormous bedstead of iron—or sarcophagus of basalt (?)—as a part of Israelitish folklore? Or rather, is not the text corrupt? It appears that ברזל sometimes represents עֲרַב ישמעאל. For a very clear instance of this see iv. 20 (furnace of iron?); but a study of xxxiii. 25 and Gen. iv. 22 will lead to the same result.[2] As to ערש, it may easily have come from ארץ. When the corruptions ערש and ברזל had come into existence, it was easy for the annotator to make up a story about the 'bedstead' (?) being shown at Rabbath-Ammon. The story about the size of the relic was a mere decoration, and אמת איש, 'the cubit of a man,' which reads so oddly, has come from אַמַּת ישמעאל, 'the cubit of Ishmael,' just as בחרט אנוש, 'with a man's pen,' should be בחרט ישמן, 'with a pen of Ishmael.'[3] The cubit of the Ishmaelite merchants was no doubt a standard (see above, on Salekah). All that the original text had was, 'Surely his land is the land of Ishmaelite Arabia.'

May we altogether trust the account which is here given of the extreme cruelty of the conquerors of Sihon and Og

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 240, 472 *f.* [2] *Ibid.* p. 109, with n. 2.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 368 (n. 2).

(ii. 34, iii. 6)? Surely this ostentatious reference to the destruction of 'women and little ones' is improbable. The passage should be taken together with Judg. xx. 48, where the destruction of the cattle and afterwards of 'all that was found,' and yet again the burning of 'all the cities that were found,' startles every reader. First, as to the highly suspicious words בהמה and נמצא. The former is probably a corruption of עֶרֶב־חמת,[1] where the southern Hamath is intended (see Isa. xi. 11, where 'Hamath' follows 'Shinar,' a N. Arabian regional name).[2] The latter, like צָמָאוֹן in Isa. xxxv. 7, should be read שׁמעון, *i.e.* שׁמעאל (= ישׁמעאל), also the name of a N. Arabian district. That עיר may represent ערב has been pointed out already, while the impossible מתם, linked as it is to עיר, *i.e.* ערב, hardly admits of being explained otherwise than as a short and corrupt form of תמלים, from תמול or אתמול, one of the current corruptions of ישׁמעאל.[3] We can now restore Judg. xx. 48 approximately to its original form, מֵעֶרֶב תמלים [ערב־חמת] עד כל־הַצָּמָאוֹן גם כל־הערים הצמאניות שלחו באש. In the passage before us (ii. 34) we have the same enigmatical phrase עיר מתם (which baffles interpreters), נשׁים (= ישׁמן), which corresponds to נמצא (= שׁמעון), and תפּ, which seems to represent נפוח (= נפתוח). We may therefore restore thus, ונחרם את־כל־עֶרֶב תמלים וישׁמן ותפוח. The last two words, neither of them being preceded by את, may be a later insertion.

We have not yet quite done with geography. The 'tent villages of Yair,' and what is said in different places about them, are certainly puzzling. Looking at the text of iii. 14 *b*, it seems most probable that אתם על־שׁמו ('them by his name') has arisen out of two corrupt forms of ישׁמעאל. אתמעל is exactly parallel to אתמול (see on ii. 34), while שׁמו reminds us of שׁם, which has been shown to be a corrupt fragment of ישׁמעאל.[4] 'Ishmael' would be a very suitable gloss on 'Argob' (see above). Thus we get, 'and called Bashan Havvoth-Yair to this day.' That 'Havvoth' is correct, however, seems to me very doubtful. But what is the right reading? We might suggest מחנות (this would suit Num.

[1] So in Isa. xxx. 6 (בהמות נגב), Jon. iv. 11, Ps. xxxvi. 7.

[2] *T. and B.* p. 185.

[3] Cp. on 'Methushael,' *T. and B.* p. 107.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 117.

xxxii. 41), of which חֲמָת might possibly be a corruption. Whether the region referred to was or was not in Bashan (Abshan = Arabia of Ishmael), is hardly a fruitful question.

Nor is it feasible to determine precisely most of the places mentioned in iii. 16, 17. If we accept the N. Arabian theory (and to some extent we cannot surely help doing so), the 'sea' or 'lake' intended will be the Dead Sea. But where shall we put the Yabbok? Its name, it is true, we can explain,[1] but this is all. Where, too, can we fix Gebal? The reading (גְּבָל) indeed is secure (see below), and the name ('mountain-land') is clear; cp. on Ps. lxxxiii. 7. It reminds us of another and more famous Gebal (Byblus in Phœnicia). But the most remarkable name is אשדת הפסגה, rendered by most 'the slopes of Pisgah,' but, I fear, by a complete misapprehension. First, as to the rendering 'the slopes (of).' To justify this either by the Aramaic אֲשַׁד, 'fudit' (Gesenius), or by the Assyrian *išdu*, 'base' (Delitzsch, *Prol.* p. 46), is a mere caprice. The secret of the word ought not to have been missed so long. Transposition of letters accounts for the strange name. אשדת is simply miswritten for אשתר. The names Ashtar and Ashḥur are equivalent.[2] The former is the name of the mountain or mountain-range on which the ark was said to have rested, though the traditional text gives us the corrupt Araraṭ;[3] with a prefixed Yaman it is the designation of the mountain from which Yahweh came to Israel.[4] The latter, with the addition of Yerahme'el, is the name of the mountain on which legend originally placed the attempted sacrifice of Isaac.[5] It is probable that near Mt. Ashtar or Mt. Ashḥur there was a city of the same name, partaking of the sacredness of the mountain. Was it Og's royal city Ashtereth (see above, p. 138)?

Next, as to הפסגה, 'the Pisgah.' This is an imaginary, non-existent name derived from Num. xxi. 20, where it is probably a corruption of הנשקפה, which was afterwards corrected into ונשקפה (הנשקף would have been better), without the deletion of הפסגה. In the process of change

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 396 *f.*
[2] *Ibid.* p. 70.
[3] See on xxxiii. 2.
[4] *T. and B.* p. 146.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 328.

the true name may have dropped out. Certainly both in iii. 27 and in Num. xxi. 20 אֲשֶׁר הַפְּעוֹר, and in our present passage (iii. 17) אשתר הפ׳ (Ashtar-Peor), would be a plausible name.

The text of iii. 17 in which our criticism issues, when translated, runs thus: 'And Arabia of the Yarḥon, and Gebal, to the sea of Kinnereth, [Arabia of the Yeraḥme'elite Sea,] below Ashtar of Pe'or, eastward.' Here we read וּגְבָל for וּגְבַל (*vv.* 16, 17; so Num. xxxiv. 6, Josh. xiii. 23, 27, xv. 12, 47). מלח comes from ירחמאל;[1] 'salt sea' is surely absurd. It will be noticed that Josh. xii. 3 is in some points more correct than the traditional text of iii. 17.

I will conclude this chapter with a reference to the strange phrase in iv. 20, מכור הברזל, 'from the iron furnace,' usually paraphrased 'from the furnace which is as hot as one for smelting iron.' This, however, is not at all obvious, and Prof. Kennett[2] allows it to be probable that 'the origin of the phrase is unknown to us.' It is indeed only a fuller experience of the habits of the scribes that will help us. The mystery lies in ברזל[ה], which is not exactly a corruption, but (see on iii. 11) a current symbol for ערב ישמעאל ('Arabia of Ishmael'). It is therefore parallel to מצרים, which is, of course, to be pronounced Miṣrim, the name of a N. Arabian land and people. Thus we get the very natural statement, —'Yahweh hath taken you and brought you from the furnace of Arăb-Ishmael, from Miṣrim.' The same striking parallelism occurs in 1 K. viii. 51, Jer. xi. 4, and we are agreeably surprised to find an equally exact parallel in Isa. xlviii. 10, 'Behold, I have refined thee in the crucible of Kasdim (Ḥashram), I have tested thee in the furnace of Yeraḥme'el.'[3]

[1] *T. and B.* p. 239.

[2] 'The Date of Deuteronomy,' *Journal of Theol. Studies*, July 1906, p. 484.

[3] Read in Isa. xlviii. 10 *a* בעלי כשרים, and in *b* בכור ירחמאל. The MT. in *a* has found no satisfactory explanation, and in *b* is hardly less enigmatical. ירחמאל in the correction is represented both by עני and by the first למעני in MT. of *v.* 11 *a* (ח fell out, and ר became נ). The second למעני has grown out of למען שמי (Duhm, Cheyne, Marti). 'Kasdim' (or rather Ḥashram; see p. 63) occurs again in *v.* 14 *b*.

CHAPTER V

THE SECOND PREAMBLE (IV. 44-XI.)

THIS preamble is to some extent virtually a development of the first portion of the Decalogue. Several points in v. 6-10 (Ex. xx. 2-6) have been treated of already (p. 103). Here it is only necessary to consider the form of a passage scarcely less important than the Decalogue—the passage known to Jewish believers as the Shema' (vi. 4-5). In its present form, doubtless, it is a bulwark of strict monotheism, but has it come down to us as it was first written? The emphasis on the unity or uniqueness of Yahweh does not fit in very well with the context; moreover, the first part of it (*v.* 4) is extremely difficult of interpretation. Three explanations are current: (1) 'Yahweh is our God, Yahweh as the only one' (Steuernagel after Ibn Ezra); (2) 'Yahweh our God, Yahweh is one' (Ewald, Oehler); (3) 'Yahweh our God is one Yahweh' (Dillmann, Driver, Stade).[1] None of these theories, however, is satisfactory, and to improve upon them one must first discover how the exegetical difficulty arose. The cause surely is corruption of the text, and this corruption was largely due to a redactor's manipulation of the text in the interest of a strict monotheism. From a comprehensive criticism of a large group of passages we appear to learn that one fuller name of the God of Israel was Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el, and that a virtual synonym for Yeraḥme'el was Ashḥur,[2] so that 'Yahweh-Ashḥur' was a possible name for the conjoined members of the divine duad. The original reading, therefore, of Dt. vi. 4 was, 'Hear, O

[1] Stade, *Bibl. Theol. des A.T.* i. 84. But the phrase 'one Yahweh' (much older than Deut., according to Stade) is highly improbable.

[2] See *T. and B.* pp. 24, 284.

Israel; Yahweh is our God [Yahweh-Ashḥur]'; in this I assume—what seems to me to have been proved—that אחד and אחר often in the traditional text take the place of אשחר, so that יהוה אחד (in our passage, but not in Zech. xiv. 9) may very well represent יהוה אשחר. Certainly the text, as it stands, is incapable of a satisfactory explanation. If we adopt this view, it will be best to suppose further that in the text underlying the present redacted text 'Yahweh-Ashḥur' stood in the margin as a variant (an older one) to 'Yahweh.' This theory is, of course, quite consistent with the admission that the present form of the text is the only one which, at any rate since the fall of the state, the progressive form of Yahwism could tolerate.

These, then, were the names of the God who brought his people out of 'the furnace of Arab-Ishmael, out of Miṣrim' (iv. 20, see above). But whither did the divine guide lead them? As we have seen (on i. 10-12), it was to the land of Canaan, which appears to have been originally represented as in N. Arabia. The second preamble gives us fresh information as to its natural gifts. This is contained in vii. 12-15, viii. 7-9, and xi. 10-12. The two latter passages are the most important. In viii. 7 the promised land is spoken of as, first of all, 'a land of torrent-streams (נחלי מים), of springs and (subterranean) deeps, springing forth in valleys and mountains.' Torrent-streams in N. Arabia are of course quite natural. But what of 'springs and *tehōmōth*'? In the Negeb at any rate the only considerable springs are in a few of the larger wâdys (torrent-valleys). One is therefore tempted to think that, just as the story of Joseph in Genesis, which originally referred to the N. Arabian Miṣrim, has been manipulated (with imperfect success)[1] so as to fit the theory that the events took place in Miṣraim (Egypt), so the original text of viii. 7 *b* has been recast so as to justify the view that the land of promise was in Palestine.

A similar hypothesis seems necessary to account for xi. 10, where the promised land, with its mountains and valleys and fertilising rains, is contrasted with 'the land . . . whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs.' Here it

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 454 *ff.*

seems to be stated that the land of מצרים was fertilised by irrigation, though the phrase 'wateredst it with thy foot' still remains obscure.[1] It certainly appears as if מצרים here ought to mean Miṣraim, *i.e.* Egypt, and that the land which is contrasted with it is Western Palestine. If so, the whole passage, xi. 10-12, which could well be spared from the context, is to be viewed as a later insertion.

Turning now to viii. 8, 9, there is no valid objection to holding that these verses (unlike *v.* 7 *b*) are original, and refer to N. Arabia. It is true that in Num. xx. 5 the wilderness of Ḳadesh is described as being 'no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates.' This, however, is quite consistent with the existence of these plants in early times in the cultivated and fruitful parts of N. Arabia. That such fruits as figs, grapes, and pomegranates did exist in the Ishmaelite or N. Arabian region called Ashkal[2] (MT., Eshkol), we learn from Num. xiii. 23, where, be it noticed in passing, the untranslatable בשנים has arisen out of בישמן,[3] 'in Ishman (Ishmael)'; this is properly a gloss on 'Ashkal,' which has intruded, as glosses so often do, into the text. From this place or district it was that the 'spies' brought back 'a cluster of the grapes of Ashḥur';[4] nor is this, as I have shown elsewhere, the only passage in which the culture of the vine is spoken of with reference to N. Arabia.[5]

The land of promise is also described (*v.* 8) as a corn country. Now it has been already stated that some of the passages referring most probably to N. Arabia have been manipulated by a redactor who did not accept, or perhaps know, the tradition of Israel's residence in N. Arabia. It is quite possible that Gen. xii. 10 and also portions of the Joseph-story (which speak of Hebrews going down into מצרים in time of famine) refer to Miṣraim, *i.e.* Egypt. There

[1] W. Max Müller remarks (*E. Bib.* col. 1226, n. 1) that water-wheels 'cannot be proved to have been known' in Egypt. 'The explanation of Deut. xi. 10 as referring to such wheels turned with the foot is questionable; most probably "watering with the foot" means carrying water.' There would seem, therefore, to be room for some new explanation.

[2] *T. and B.* p. 247.

[3] The same correction of בשנים is required in 1 Chr. xi. 21, and of שנים in Ezra viii. 27.

[4] Read אשכול ענבי יאשחר.

[5] *T. and B.* pp. 453 *f.*

appears, however, to be evidence enough elsewhere, that there were parts of the N. Arabian border-land where, by the help no doubt of irrigation, the soil was capable of producing grain. Elsewhere[1] I have referred to Num. xi. 5 (revised text), 2 K. xviii. 32, and Ps. civ. 15 (revised text). Even if the second of these passages should be due to a redactor who knows only of a king of Assyria, yet the others remain.[2]

'A land of oil-olive-trees and honey.' A fresh feature of the description. But the expression זֵית שֶׁמֶן is strange, and parallels such as עֵץ רענן (which—see on xii. 2—is most probably to be explained as 'tree of Ra'aman') suggest that שמן (as in Isa. x. 27) comes from ישמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל. The phrase indicates, therefore, that olive-trees flourished in N. Arabia. A similar phrase is זֵית יצהר (2 K. xviii. 32), which must surely come from זֵית אשחר.[3] Apparently the Israelites on their first arrival in the highly cultivated regions of the border-land admired the olive-trees, and called the best trees of this species olive-trees of Ishmael, or of Ashḥur. As to the honey, what is meant is probably grape-honey (the modern *dibs*). That this was produced in N. Arabia appears, I think, from Gen. xliii. 11, where the present sent by Jacob to Joseph from (the southern) Canaan includes honey. The same delicacy is referred to in vi. 3, where (cp. Ex. iii. 8, Num. xiii. 27, etc.) the promised land is said to be 'flowing with milk and honey.' This phrase, however, is plainly of mythological origin.[4]

'A land whose stones are iron, and out of whose mountains thou mayest dig copper.' This is the close of the description. Iron and copper do not appear to have been found in Palestine, though the well-known Lebanon was certainly explored for copper by the ancients.[5] What

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 224, 453 *f.*

[2] I cannot discover that the most recent commentators on Numbers and on the Psalter have produced satisfactory explanations of Num. xi. 5, Ps. civ. 15.

[3] Note the Levite name יצהר, Ex. vi. 18, which has the same origin. The Levite names are as a rule of N. Arabian affinities.

[4] See *T. and B.* pp. 84, 529 *f.*

[5] See Assyrian passages in *E. Bib.* col. 893 (n. 5); Del., *Paradies*, p. 353.

was the case in the southern Lebanon?[1] If 'mountains of copper' in Zech. vi. 1 were correct, it might be taken to prove that copper was found there, for the scene of the vision in Zech. vi. 1-8 appears to be laid in the southern borderland. I think, however, that נחשת in the MT. is sometimes a corruption,[2] and that it is so here. But it is very possible[3] that the place where Hiram cast the bronze was in N. Arabia (1 K. vii. 46), and almost certain that in Jer. xv. 12 'northern iron' should be 'iron of Ṣibe'on (Ishmael).' That the Ethbaalites (miscalled Philistines) were skilled in metallurgy, appears from 1 S. xiii. 19-21. A passage in the letter of Aristeas (§ 119) may also, in spite of its lateness, be quoted here: *ἐλέγετο δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν παρακειμένων ὀρέων τῆς Ἀραβίας μέταλλα χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου συνίστασθαι πρότερον. ἐκλέλειπται δὲ ταῦτα, καθ' ὃν ἐπεκράτησαν Πέρσαι χρόνον.*[4]

In vii. 12-15 Yahweh's faithfulness, it is said, will be shown in four ways: (1) in the multiplication of his people, (2) in the abundant harvests, (3) in the increase of their cattle, and (4) in their exemption from pestilences. First, as to the pestilences. That pestilences of the Egyptian type[5] were known in Palestine appears from Am. iv. 10, where the מִצְרַיִם of the pointed text must surely give the true text. From this obvious reference to Egypt, however, we are not entitled to infer that the N. Arabian theory is put out of court. Close by, *i.e.* in *v.* 13, there appears to be a prominent reference to N. Arabia. It will, therefore, probably be best to suppose that *v.* 15 is a redactional insertion.

Next, as to the N. Arabian reference in *v.* 13. It occurs in the clause on the increase of the cattle. Those two strange phrases שגר אלפיך and עשתרות צאנך have been much misunderstood. Haupt, for instance, thinks that שגר means 'dam,' 'female parent,'[6] and Barton says of the latter that it is derived from primitive times 'when the connexion of the offering with a deity bearing this name [Ashtaroth] had been

[1] Del. *Paradies*, pp. 123, 457.

[2] See on xxxiii. 25, and *T. and B.* p. 109.

[3] See *Crit. Bib.* on both passages.

[4] Cp. Winckler, *Kritische Schriften*, i. 124 *f.* Are the copper mines at Punon in Edom referred to?

[5] G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geogr.* p. 157.

[6] *JBL* xxvi. 45 *f.*

observed by the introduction of no other epithet.'[1] Both phrases, however, need to be more critically examined. Experience of textual phenomena elsewhere shows that אש' צ' has come from אשתר צבעון, 'Ashtar of Ṣibe'on (= Ishmael),' a regional name. As for שגר אלפיד, it is hardly too bold to group שגר with the highly improbable גרש in xxxiii. 14 (considered later), and regard it as a corrupt form of a regional name, in fact of the name גשׁר, or more correctly אשחר. Similarly אלפיד represents ירח[ח]באל, *i.e.* ירחמאל. Geshur- or Ashḥur-Yerahme'el will be a gloss on אדמתך (parallel to האדמה, xxviii. 4). On Ex. xiii. 12 it has already been remarked that שגר, or גשׁר, is probably a gloss on ארץ כנעני, the original 'Canaan,' as we have seen, being probably in the southern border-land.[2]

In ix. 1, 2, a statement of some importance is made. Elsewhere (*e.g.* in vii. 1, Ex. iii. 8, etc.) a number of different peoples are mentioned as inhabiting the land of Canaan. Here, however, only one people is referred to by name, though in the opening words the plural 'nations' occurs. Similarly in Am. ii. 10 the prophet says that the Israelites were brought up 'to occupy the land of the Amorites,' with which passages like Gen. xlviii. 22 may be compared. It would seem therefore, that 'Anakite' and 'Amorite' are, equivalent, and in fact ענק, like עמלק, is probably a corruption of ירחמאל,[3] while אמר, not less probably, comes from אֲרָם, a popular derivative of ירחמאל.

And what are the traditional limits of the land of promise? An account is given in Gen. xv. 18, Ex. xxiii. 31, Dt. i. 7, xi. 24, Josh. i. 4. The first three passages have been treated already; we now come to xi. 24. In one direction, it appears, the land extended 'from the wilderness (see on Ex. xxiii. 31) unto Lebanon,'[4] *i.e.* the southern Lebanon (see on i. 7); in another, 'from the stream, the the stream Perāth (Ephrath) as far as Yaman-Ashḥurân.' That Yaman was often written Yam, has been shown elsewhere;[5] אחרון may come from אשחרן, like אחר from

[1] *Semitic Origins*, p. 282; cp. p. 105.
[2] *T. and B.* p. 550. [3] *Ibid.* pp. 121, 247.
[4] Reading ועד הל' (Grätz, Steuernagel).
[5] *T. and B.* p. 6 (n. 3).

אשחר. The traditional text gives 'the western sea,' a phrase possible enough in itself (see Joel ii. 20, Zech. xiv. 8), but less probable than a definitely N. Arabian place-name. In Zech. ix. 10 and Ps. lxxii. 8 the corresponding expression is 'to the ends of the land.' This, however, seems to be a substitute for some more definite phrase.

A more important because more distinct geographical statement is given in xi. 30. It will be noticed that the preceding verse contains a command that at a future time 'the blessing' shall be set on the former of the two mountains (no doubt anciently sacred) Gerizzim and Ebal, and 'the curse' on the latter. A similar and complementary injunction is given in xxvii. 11-13, the fulfilment of which is narrated in Josh. viii. 33. Evidently Dt. xi. 30 should state exactly where these two mountains are situated. The description, however, presents some special difficulties: (1) the words אחרי דרך מבוא השמש, generally rendered 'behind the road of sunset';[1] (2) the reference to the so-called 'Arābah, which, if the Jordan-valley be meant, is remote from the mountains Gerizzim and Ebal, as well as from the 'sacred tree of Moreh' of the established tradition; (3) the reference, seemingly so clear, but really so obscure, to 'the Gilgal' ('over against the Gilgal'). Prof. Ed. Meyer thinks that the text has been adulterated in the interest of a tradition which placed Gerizzim and Ebal in the Jordan-valley near Jericho, a tradition which he also finds in xxvii. 11-13, Josh. viii. 30 *ff.*, and which owes its origin to the exigences of the Jewish controversy with the Samaritans. Such a tradition, however, is a mere imagination, and a keener textual criticism reveals a better way of dealing with the difficulties.

It is obvious that 'behind the road of sunset' is by no means suitable as a geographical definition, and that אחרי and השמש must be incorrect. For the former Steuernagel suggests אחריו, 'behind it,' *i.e.* 'westward of the Jordan.' But why should this be followed by 'towards sunset'? Can no better explanation be found? As for השמש, we know that 'shemesh' is sometimes not the ordinary word for 'the

[1] Ed. Meyer boldly asserts that, though the words דרך וגו' are corrupt, the meaning must be 'on the road to the west' (*Die Israeliten*, p. 544).

sun,' but a popular corruption of 'Shema' = 'Ishmael,'[1] and that redactional insertions of the article are frequent. And as for אחרי, we may recall the fact that, like אחר and אחד, it repeatedly represents the regional name אשחור;[2] 'Ashḥur' would be a perfectly natural geographical gloss on 'Ishmael.' Thus we are enabled to give the words referred to the only natural interpretation, viz. 'towards the entrance of Shemesh' (*i.e.* of 'Ishmael'), comparing the familiar phrase מבוא חמת (Num. xxxiv. 8, Josh. xiii. 5),'the entrance (or neighbourhood) of Hamath.'

We may then (see on i. 1) safely venture to restore בַּעֲרַב הַיַּרְדֵּן for MT.'s בְּעֵבֶר הירדן; בערבה, too, may be corrected into בַּעֲרָב. Further, הגלגל may easily have come from הגלעד; the two names 'Gilgal' and 'Gilead' are occasionally confounded both in the traditional Hebrew text and in that which underlies 𝔊. And in this connexion it may be well to point out that the mountains referred to must have been close to Shechem (Shakram), because of the mention of 'Moreh'[3] (Gen. xii. 6), and also (if I am right) of 'Gilead' (cp. Num. xxvi. 31, where 'Shechem' is reckoned among the sons of Gilead). That the name Shechem is not expressly mentioned, is no doubt at first sight surprising.[4] The reason most probably is that Shechem (Shakram) was first the chief and then (in the original Deuteronomy) the one sacred place of the N. Arabian Israelites. At a later time, however, the original Deuteronomy was adapted to the use of the Israelites of Palestine, and Shechem was supplanted by Jerusalem. Consequently, both in xi. 30 and in xii. 5 (see above) the name Shechem or its equivalent is intentionally passed over. It only remains to add that, at the end of *v.* 30, אלוני should, of course, be אלון (see Sam. and 𝔊). One sacred tree is meant.

The whole passage, in its (probably) most original form, will read thus: 'Surely they (*i.e.* Gerizzim and Ebal) are in Arabia of the Yarḥon, towards the entrance of Ishmael [*gloss*, Ashḥur], in the land of the Canaanites who dwell [in Arabia] over against Gilead beside the sacred tree of Moreh.'

[1] *T. and B.* p. 273.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 276.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 221.
[4] Dillmann has already noticed this.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUDING SECTIONS (XXVII.-XXXIV.)

In chap. xxvii. the discourse of the great legislator is interrupted. It is probable, indeed, that *vv.* 1-4 and *vv.* 7 *b*-8 belong to a Deuteronomistic writer, and that *vv.* 5-7 *a* belong to an older source (JE). Still one can see that the Deuteronomist has no objection to the statement that an altar was erected, and that sacrifices were offered, on Mt. Ebal.[1] What, then, becomes of the inference generally drawn from Dt. xii. 5, that Deuteronomy forbids more than the one sanctuary at Jerusalem? In reply most are satisfied with remarking that the occupation of Canaan was still future; an altar elsewhere than at Jerusalem was therefore not yet illegitimate. But is this at all satisfactory? Must there not be some other explanation which will harmonise xxvii. 4 with xii. 5? If it has been rightly held that the original sanctuary of the early Israelites was at or near the southern Shechem, or more accurately at or near Asshur-Yarḥam (see on xii. 5), and if Ebal (עיבל) is a corruption of אתבעל = ישמעאל,[2] it is plausible to connect the sanctuary with Mt. Ebal, and to suppose that the sacrifice on that mountain was an anticipation of the time when, in the Holy Land of the southern border, sacrifices would be offered at Asshur-Yarḥam (= Beth-Yeraḥme'el). A parallel anticipation is to be found in Gen. xxii., where the interrupted sacrifice of Isaac is an

[1] For 'Ebal' in xxvii. 4 Sam. reads 'Gerizzim,' which Kennicott and Ed. Meyer adopt. The chief argument is that in *vv.* 12 *f.* Ebal is the mountain of cursing, and Gerizzim of blessing (*Die Israelit.* p. 546).

[2] Ishmael and Yeraḥme'el are equivalent (*T. and B.* p. 272).

anticipation of the sacrifices one day to be offered on Asshur-Yerahme'el.[1]

As to the text. That עיבל (*v.* 4) is a much-worn form of יתבעל (= ישמעאל) is plain. In Gen. xxxvi. 23 this name is borne by a son of Shobal (= Ishmael). It is needless to alter it. In *v.* 2 why, we may ask, are the great stones to be plastered? Driver replies[2] that 'in Egypt it was the custom to put a layer of stucco, or paint, over the stone used in architecture, of whatever quality, even granite.' But, as Kennett remarks, 'the instructions about the plastering, if genuine, should immediately precede *v.* 8,'[3] to which we may add that in no similar context is a coating of paint or gypsum spoken of. Textual criticism must therefore be applied. In xi. 30 (see p. 152) the mountains Gerizzim and Ebal are said to be 'in the entrance of Ishmael,' and to 'Ishmael' there is a gloss 'Asshur.' Now if שיד is corrupt, the easiest correction is plainly אַשּׁוּר = שׁוּר (as in Gen. xvi. 7). ושדת as plainly comes from באשתר (see on אשדת, iii. 17), and אתם from אתמעל = ישמעאל. Thus the land which the Israelites are to enter, and where Mt. Ebal is (*vv.* 2, 4), is stated in the gloss to be in Asshur-Ishmael.

Another improvement can be made in *v.* 8 *b*. It is usually supposed that *v.* 8 differs from the opening of *v.* 3 in that it commands very distinct writing. There is certainly no objection to the double infinitive בֵּאֵר הֵיטֵב. But there is great doubt about the verb באר (see on i. 5), and the rendering 'very plainly' can hardly be sustained. But why should there not be another geographical gloss? בארהיטב comes easily and naturally from יתבעל[4] באשחר, *i.e.* 'in Ashḥur-Ishmael.'

We now pass on to chap. xxviii. Without entering deeply into analytic criticism, one may regard it as certain that from *v.* 20 onwards many larger or smaller insertions have been made. One of these is *v.* 68. It is usually supposed to declare that the Israelites shall once more be

[1] *T. and B.* p. 328. [2] *Deuteronomy*, p. 296.
[3] *Journal of Theol. Studies*, July 1906, p. 495.
[4] Cp. יסנה in 2 K. xxi. 19, and מהיטבאל, Gen. xxxvi. 39 (*T. and B.* p. 432).

brought into Egypt, and this time in ships, and shall there be sold into slavery. The ships (Driver, slave-galleys) are taken to be those of the Phœnicians (cp. Am. i. 9; Ezek. xxvii. 13; Joel iv. 6). It is not certain, however, that the three prophetic passages referred to really speak of the Phœnicians; more probably they speak of N. Arabian peoples (Miṣṣor, Yaman, Tubal, Meshek).[1] Moreover, the parallelism of phrase between *v.* 68 ('on the road whereof,' etc.) and xvii. 16 ('return no more on that road'; Miṣrim is spoken of) makes it improbable that a sea-voyage is spoken of. Now it so happens that אניות in MT. is sometimes a corruption; can it be a rash conjecture that it may be so here? Let us refer to previous experience. In Gen. xlix. 13 אניות, and in Gen. xii. 16, xlix. 11, Judg. v. 10 אתנת and אתנו, represent either [איתנ]ים or [אתמנ]ים, both of which ultimately stand for 'Ishmaelites.'[2] Here, however, it seems best to read באיתן or באתמן,[3] where ב may either be the preposition בְּ or a fragment of ערב = עב (*T. and B.* p. 571).

The result, however surprising, seems plain. 'Arab-Ethan' or 'Arab-Ethman' is a gloss upon 'Miṣrim,' which was, in fact, considered a Yeraḥme'elite country.[4] The scribe wished to put the reader on his guard against supposing Miṣraim, *i.e.* Egypt, to be referred to—the very mistake which the received text has made.

Chap. xxxii. contains difficult passages which call for a searching re-examination. It presents us with a song which, according to xxxi. 16-22, xxxii. 44, was written by Moses to warn the later Israelites that their apostasy and its bitter consequences had been foreseen. It is really, however, a work of the period preceding the great exile. The 'not-people' in *v.* 21 (see below) is a N. Arabian people; in *v.* 42 *b* its name is revealed as 'Ishmael,' and in a gloss as 'Asshur,' or 'Ephrath of Arabia.' Cp. 2 K. xxiv. 2, where כשדים has come from כשרם, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el.[5] It closes with a promise of mercy and deliverance.

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 172 (Miṣṣor), 160-162 (Yaman, Tubal, Meshek).
[2] *Ibid.* p. 225.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 504 (n. 1).
[4] See *T. and B.* pp. 32 (n. 2), 441.
[5] See above, p. 63.

In *v.* 5, which presents the infidelity of Israel as a contrast to the fidelity of Yahweh, there is much to invite textual criticism. We have a right to presume that some definite violation of religious duty is referred to, but in the form which most critics give to the verse no such reference is made. That *v.* 5 *a* is highly corrupt, is obvious. 'Corruptly has dealt towards him—not his sons are their blemish,' though given by Driver, is not really accepted by him. But whether 'a twisted and crooked generation' is definite enough, may be doubted. It may be granted that the address to Israel in *v.* 6 is perfectly natural. It is, in fact, the folly of this people's conduct which has first of all, from an antique point of view, to be exhibited. But it is *not* natural that in the prelude to this address Israel should be described rhetorically as 'a twisted and crooked generation'; we require something much more definite. In these circumstances, much weight seems to attach to the fact that פתלתל is a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*. Both this word and the preceding one should be names of deities. If so, פתל (omit the dittographed תל), should, like תפל in i. 1, represent אתבעל, *i.e.* ישמעאל, one of the names of the god of the Yeraḥme'elites.[1] עקש should also be a god's name; like אכיש (1. S. xxvii. 5), עשק (Gen. xxvi. 20), and עושק (Ps. lxxii. 4), it is a corrupt form of אשחר, another god of the same people.[2] דור probably comes from דורשי; ד' is frequently used in connexion with the cultus. Returning now to *v.* 5 *a*, we apply for help first to 𝔊. This version presupposes שחתו לא לו בני מום (so too Sam.).[3] Here בְּנֵי for בניו is a step in the right direction. לא לו, however, is no improvement. לא, as often elsewhere, comes from אל, and אל with מום (from מרמה)[4] prefixed is probably ירחמאל. Thus we get—

The sons of Yeraḥme'el have acted corruptly towards him,
Those who seek Ashḥur and Ethbaal.

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 29 *f.* [2] *Ibid.* pp. 23, 530.

[3] So too Steuernagel (but omitting לא as miswritten for לו). But בְּנֵי מוּם, 'die Schändlichen,' is impossible.

[4] מרמה, apparently 'deceit,' in Ps. xvii. 1, xliii. 1, cix. 2, really comes from ירחמאל. So מרמה (1 Chr. viii. 10), the name of a 'son' of Shaḥaraim (Shaḥar = Ashḥur); and מרמות, a personal name (Ezra x. 36, etc.).

The idea in *a* is that the Israelites are now no better than 'sons of Yeraḥme'el.' And yet Israel's father and fashioner is not Yeraḥme'el (*v.* 6). In *b* one is reminded of Isa. ii. 6, which should most probably run thus[1]—

כי נטש עמו בית יעקב For he has forsaken his people, the house of Jacob,
כי מלאו כמרים Because they are full of [Arabian] priests,
וינאמו כאתבלים And give oracles like the Ethbalites,
ובהיכלי רכמן יכשפו And practise sorcery in the temples of Rakman.

'Rakman' is a corrupt, popular form of Yeraḥme'el; and 'Ethbal' (like Ethba'al), of Ishmael. Both names may be applied alike to the people and to its god.

How foolish was Israel, the poet implies. For Yeraḥme'el (regarded as distinct from Yahweh) was only an inferior deity—a *ben-ēl*, or member of the larger divine company. But Yahweh himself is Israel's lord (*v.* 9), who is supreme over all the nations and their divine guardians[2] (read בְּנֵי אֵל with 𝔊; *v.* 8 *b*); cp. iv. 19, xxix. 25 [26]. True, there was a time when Israel had no divine guardian, or none that recognised his obligations. Yahweh 'found' Israel languishing in the Ishmaelite desert, friendless and weak. But soon he made his people ride on the heights of the land, *i.e.* take triumphal possession of the N. Arabian highland-country (*vv.* 10, 13). בתהו ילל ישמן (*v.* 10 *a*) has been misunderstood; 'in the waste of the howling of a desert' (Driver) could only be defended from a supposed textual necessity. Steuernagel more wisely places the dots which symbolise ignorance. ישמן, however, is plainly a form of ישמעאל,[3] and ילל, like אליל (an image of the god Yeraḥme'el) and הילל ('Yeraḥme'el ben Ashḥur,' Isa. xiv. 12), comes from ירחמאל. Thus we get (keeping ובתהו), 'and in the waste of * of Ishmael'; for 'Yeraḥme'el' (ילל) one may fairly regard as a variant to 'Ishmael,' and therefore to be omitted from the text. The lines or verses, however, are

[1] Cp. *T. and B.* pp. 41, 62 (with n. 1), 376 (n. 1).

[2] In *Clem. Recogn.* (ii. 32), however, Israel's guardian is the greatest of the archangels (*i.e.* Michael). Lueken, *Michael*, pp. 101 *f.*

[3] *T. and B.* p. 29.

trimeters; we must therefore suppose that the word which should follow ובתהו has fallen out.[1]

After telling us of the conquest, the poet proceeds to enumerate the luxuries with which Israel will be fed in the fertile land. Various reasons lead us to question the text. Is such a lengthy list of delicacies likely, especially in such a serious context? Surely not. Is the phraseology natural? And though there are parallel passages relating to the rich products of the soil of Canaan, are we sure that this is more than appearance? These three points need careful consideration. As to the first, it must be admitted that the catalogue of luxuries of food in *v.* 14 reads very oddly. Certainly not all of them can be described as 'fruitful growths of the country' (שדי תנובת), nor is the word וינקהו, on which the designations of the foods are grammatically dependent, appropriate for the 'fat of lambs,' etc. The material, too, is superabundant for the metre. Gunkel has attempted[2] to remedy this by omitting בני בשן ועתודים. More plausibly, however, he might have omitted עם־חֵלֶב כליות חטה, where חטה might perhaps be viewed as a corruption of a misplaced ה[א]חמ, thus leaving only עם־חלב כליות, an improbable phrase, which might have come from עם־חֵלֶב בכרות, 'with the milk of female camels.'[3] This, however, is equally insufficient for a line, and is not here proposed.

I have called the phrase עם־חלב כליות improbable. Still more so is it if we add חטים, in spite of the fact that חלב חטה occurs in Ps. lxxxi. 17, and ח׳ חטים in Ps. cxlvii. 14. Most, indeed, take this to be 'a poetical designation of fine flour' (Kennedy, *E. Bib.* col. 1539), for which Gesenius (*Thes.*, *s.v.* חֵלֶב) gives us a Greek and an Arabic parallel. But how can we accept this view when we observe how unsuitable the Hebrew phrases quoted are to their contexts? Surely they are corrupt, and therefore beyond interpretation.

To make further progress let us study our passage in connexion with Gen. xlix. 11 *f.* There, too, we meet with milk and wine in a context where we should not have

[1] Klostermann's emendation (*Der Pentateuch*, p. 288) giving the sense, 'und in Irrgängen (?) holte er ihn heim,' is wide of the mark.

[2] Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, i. 578. [3] See *E. Bib.* col. 3088.

expected them; most probably the true text spoke of the subjugation of Yeraḥme'el. Similarly in Ps. lxxxi. 17 and cxlvii. 14 it is deliverance from the N. Arabians that is most probably referred to; חלב has come from חמל = ירחמאל, חטה from חֲמָת, and חטים from חמתים (the southern Hamath[1] is referred to); cp. חמטה, a place-name, Josh. xv. 54. May it not be so here? The original lines, which described the conquest of the N. Arabian border-land, cannot indeed be recovered. Probably they became first corrupted and then intermixed with names of districts or clans which intruded into the text, so that the scribe had before him a farrago of unintelligible and corrupt words, and had to make the best sense that he could out of it. Observe that צאן sometimes (*e.g.* Ps. lxxviii. 70) represents צבעון (Ṣibe'on = Ishmael); that עתודים may come from עשתרים (= אשחרים, Ashḥurites), כליות from אשכל,[2] דם ענב from רקם צבעון,[3] תשתה from ישחית, and חמר from ירחם (Yarḥam). On the whole, there is no reason to deny the genuineness of *v.* 13 *b*, but we must, I fear, admit that *v.* 14 was inserted later. Not, however, in its present form, for חלב כליות חטה, בני בשן ועתודים, and חמר have all the appearance of representing, not foods, but peoples; *i.e.* the insertion, *v.* 14, originally spoke of the conquest of peoples and clans.

Such being the case, Sam. and 𝔊 may be right in prefixing to *v.* 15 the words ויאכל יעקב וישבע. As Klostermann remarks, this is supported by the apparent references in xxxi. 20, Neh. ix. 25. The next stichus is given only in a mutilated form in almost all MSS. of 𝔊. Bickell, however, refers[4] to a Syro-hexaplar MS., which gives *καὶ ἐλιπάνθη ὁ ἠγαπημένος καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν.* This is in accordance with the Hebrew text, which runs | וישמן ישרון ויבעט שמנת עבית כשית. Here we first note the two doubtful words יבעט and כשית. The latter word occurs only here; the former occurs also in 1 S. ii. 29, where, however, בעט is supposed to

[1] See Isa. xi. 11 *b* (a list of Arabian peoples), and cp. *T. and B.* p. 196.

[2] See *T. and B.* p. 247.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 503.

[4] 'Krit. Bearbeitung der Proverbien,' *Wiener Zt. f. die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, v. 100.

mean 'to tread under foot,' *i.e.* 'despise,' a sense which does not suit here. Probably both words are corrupt; one comes from אתבעל, the other from וַיִּקְשֹׁ ('hardened himself'). עבית (a curious word here) is also corrupt; a dittographed אתבעל most probably underlies it. Thus we get only one stichus, וַיִּשְׁמַן יְשֻׁרוּן וַיִּקְשֹׁ. 'Yeshurun' is an old name for 'Israel'[1] (see xxxiii. 5, 26; Isa. xliv. 2). The parallel stichus has dropped out, or rather been supplanted by glosses.

Israel's great offence against their divine Benefactor, that by which they proved incontestably that they had forsaken him, was sacrificing to the 'not-gods,' who are called in MT. *shēdīm* (𝔊 δαιμόνια). This word (*v.* 17) is commonly connected with the Ass. *šêdu*, and explained 'demigods.' But the Ass. *šêdu* is out of place both here and in Ps. cvi. 37; equally so is the sense 'demon,' 'evil spirit,' attaching to the Aram. שידא. Whether שד occurs as a divine name or title in Phœnician is highly doubtful; the proper name גדשד may be read גדשר, where שר may be a shortened form of אשר or אשור, which we know well as a divine name, and which may have spread northwards in the Arabian migrations. Most probably שדים in both the passages in which MT. gives it should rather be שֻׁרִים, *i.e.* אַשֻׁרִים, 'Asshurs,' *i.e.* 'Asshur-images.' Similarly שורים in Hos. xii. 12, and שור in Ps. cvi. 20 *b*[2] should be, respectively, אשורים and אשור. Just so אלילים, commonly explained 'worthless gods,' from אליל, 'worthlessness' (*BDB*, p. 47), means rather (see p. 157) 'Yeraḥme'el images,' and הבלים is a partly ironical corruption of חמלים = ירחמאלים, 'images of Hebel or Yeraḥme'el.' Cp. xxxii. 21, where 'their *hebels*' are called 'not-gods' (לא־אל) precisely as 'the *shēdīm*' are called לא אלה (*v.* 17); cp. הבלי שוא, 'useless *hebels*,' in Ps. xxxi. 7.

This result appears to me of considerable importance.

[1] It comes from אַשְׁרוֹן, 'one belonging to Asshur,' thus indicating the origin of the Israelites (see *T. and B.* pp. 24, 404). Cp. ספר הישר = ס' אשחור (*Crit. Bib.* p. 251).

[2] The text of *vv.* 19 *f.*, translated, should run, 'They made a calf at Horeb, | and worshipped a molten image, | and (so) exchanged their glory | for the likeness of Asshur-Ashkal.' | אכל and עשב represent ירחמאל and ישמעאל respectively. The latter is a gloss on the former.

The *shēdīm*, as we have been wont to call them, are not mere demi-gods, but in the fullest sense gods. Indeed, the parallelism of Ex. xxxiv. 15[1] sufficiently shows this. To say that 'the precise nature of the ideas associated with the *shēdīm* is uncertain' (Driver), is no longer possible. The idea is that of full divinity; nothing less, indeed, will satisfy the conditions of the case. They are supernatural beings who pretend to be, but are not, gods. Another name for the so-called *shēdīm* in MT. is *śe'īrīm* (Lev. xvii. 7,[2] 2 Chr. xi. 15), generally explained 'the hairy ones,' 'earth-demons' (like the Arabian *jinn*).[3] They were, however, much more than this; for they are made equivalent to the divine steer-idols of Jeroboam, and have regular priesthoods attached to them (2 Chr. *l.c.*). To separate them from the so-called *shēdīm* is impossible; indeed, שעירים, like the *shōrīm* in Hosea and the *shēdīm* in the 'Song of Moses,' comes from אַשֻּׁרִים.[4] These 'Asshur-images' were, of course, not mere images; they were inhabited by the god Asshur, who could, in virtue of his divinity, take up his abode wheresoever he would.

In *v.* 21 we are told that Israel's divinely sent foes are a 'not-people' (לא עם), *i.e.* being impious (נבל), and not having true insight (*v.* 20), they are not worthy to be called a people. In *v.* 32 they are further compared to a vine, whose stock is derived from Sodom and (consequently) its 'tender grapes' from Gomorrah. The writer hardly knew that the Sodom-story originally referred to N. Arabia.[5] At any rate, this probable result of criticism makes a reference to Sodom highly appropriate in this context. שדמות has not been adequately explained. Read וסמדָם מֵעמרה; cp. 𝔊 *καὶ ἡ κλήματις αὐτῶν ἐκ Γομόρρας*. סמדר can be rendered 'tender grapes.' See *E. Bib.*, 'Grapes,' 3, with note 1, and cp. Ibn Ġanaḥ, in Ges. *Thes.* 959 *f.*

[1] '(Take heed to thyself) lest thou make a compact, and they go harlot-like after their gods, and sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice.'

[2] 'And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto the *śe'irim*, after whom they have gone harlot-like.' The parallelism with Ex. xxxiv. 15 (see note 1) is complete.

[3] W. R. Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, ed. 2, pp. 120, 441.

[4] See above, p. 27.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 298.

A few gleanings remain. In *v.* 42 the last two stichi cannot be right. 'With the blood of the slain and of the captives, | with the head of * of the enemy. ||' The three improbable words are ושביה, מראש, and פרעות. It is possible indeed that the poet archaises, and that he means to say that the captive foemen shall be devoted by destruction to Yahweh. This, however, is not very probable. It was usual to carry away the captives (cp. xxviii. 49, Isa. xx. 4, Hab. i. 9), and if the poet had meant a savage archaism, he would have expressed himself more clearly. Even in Ps. lxviii., which is surely on the whole cruel enough, no mention is made of the slaughter of captives. On the other hand, we know that יבש is a common corruption of ישמעאל, and that the foe spoken of is N. Arabian. Probably, therefore, we should read מדם חללי ישמ', 'with the blood of the slain of Ishmael.' As to מראש, we know that ראש is one of the distortions of אַשֻּׁר (see *e.g.* Ezek. xxxviii. 2), and as to פרעות, on which so much useless ingenuity has been spent, it is simply miswritten for אפרת, or (less probably) צרפת, both of which we know to be the names of districts in N. Arabia.[1] That אויב may be miswritten for עֲרָב, has been pointed out on Ps. iii. 8, vii. 6, etc. Thus we get, 'With the blood of the slain of Ishmael, | [with Asshur, Ephrath of Arabia]. ||' The second stichus I take to be a gloss on 'Ishmael.' Indeed, the next verse (*v.* 43) also is perhaps not free from glosses. הרנינו is surely wrong. Like הרמון in Am. iv. 3 (MT. ההרמונה), and somewhat as ארנון and רענן, it may be a scribal or popular corruption of ירחמאל, another scribal gloss on 'Ishmael.' גוים עמו might perhaps come from גּוֹרֵי אֲרָם, 'nations of Aram.' At any rate, let the problem be here stated. The original stichus seems to have disappeared.

Here the Priestly Writer intervenes (*vv.* 48-52). He tells how Moses was commanded to ascend a high mountain

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 262, 419; 62, 312. In Am. iii. 12 *b* (original text) we find 'Ephrath of Ḥamath' coupled with 'Ramshaḳ (if that is the right form) of Asshur.' Both these compound names are glosses on 'Shimron.' There may, however, have been more than one Ephrath, or, better, Ephrath may have had (like Asshur or Ashḥur) a larger and a narrower reference. In Num. xxiv. 17 (original text) we meet with 'Ephrath-Moab,' parallel to 'the sons of Ashtar.'

and enjoy the sight of the Promised Land before he died. What is the mountain's name? We read in MT., עֲלֵה אל־הר הָעֲבָרִים הזה הר־נְבוֹ, precisely as in Num. xxvii. 12, except that there הר נבו is not given. עיי העברים is the name of a station of the Israelites in Num. xxi. 11, xxxiii. 44. We know, however, that עבר is often an early corruption of עֲרַב (Arabia); see *T. and B.* p. 197 (on Gen. x. 21) and p. 245 (on Gen. xiv. 13). Read הר הערבים, 'the mountain of the Arabians.' הר נבו is more difficult. Winckler[1] long ago warned against identifying נבו too confidently with the Babylonian god's name Nabû. In Isa. xlvi. 1 the original text probably had נרע בלקר סנבו, where סנבו is = Sanibu, the name of an Ammonite king, and is compounded of סן = שן = ישמן and בו = אבו = [ו]ערב.[2] Ishmael-Arâb may have been the original meaning of the name underlying Nebo. This gives a suitable alternative to Asshur-Yeraḥme'el (see on iii. 27); it also accords excellently with the place-name 'Nebo of Ashḥur' (MT. נבו אחר needs correction) in Neh. vii. 33. I think that the opinion that 'Mount Nebo' indicates the wide spread of the cultus of Nabû is as doubtful as the similar opinion about 'Mount Sinai.'[3]

In xxxiii. 6-25 we have a second series of poetic descriptions of the characteristics and fortunes of the tribes of Israel, parallel to that in Gen. xlix. Simeon is excepted, but (otherwise than in Gen. xlix.) Joseph is regarded as a double tribe, and Zebulun and Issachar are combined in one saying. Levi and Joseph are treated with more fulness than the other tribes. The order of the tribes deviates from that in Gen. xlix., which is also the ordinary one. The composition is usually referred to the time of either Jeroboam I. (Dillm., Driver) or Jeroboam II. (Kuenen, Reuss, Stade, G. F. Moore). According to G. A. Smith, 'the northern origin of the poem is universally admitted, and indeed is very obvious' (*Expositor*, March 1905, p. 236, n. 2).

Verses 2-5 and 26-29 form a satisfactory whole in themselves; we may call it a psalm. The subject is the deliverance of the people, which is described as due to a

[1] *Gesch. Isr.* i. (1896), p. 120 (n. 2). [2] Cp. *T. and B.* p. 51.
[3] *T. and B.* p. 527.

theophany. Henceforth Israel will dwell securely in the enjoyment of the divine favour.

The combination of the psalm and the garland of 'blessings' may have been one of the latest acts of a redactor of Deuteronomy. The text is in much need of criticism. Pioneer work has been done by C. J. Ball, *Proc. of Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, 1896, pp. 118-137. First, as to *vv.* 2-5, 26-29. The description of the theophany is historically important, for it shows that at the late period to which this poem or psalm apparently belongs there was still a recollection of the N. Arabian origin of the worship of Yahweh. It is true, we can gather this with abundant certainty even from the present form of the Book of Exodus. It was at Sinai or Horeb that the fundamental laws of Israel are said to have been given; at Horeb, too, specially called 'the mountain of the Godhead' (1 K. xix. 8; cp. Ex. iii. 1), that the prophet Elijah sought his God; and it was at any rate in N. Arabian sanctuaries (see p. 157) that common Israelites, contrary to the teaching of the prophets, sought priestly oracles. And now from Deut. xxxiii. 2, as well as from Hab. iii. 3, Ps. lxviii. 8, cp. Ezek. i. 4 (theophany 'from Ṣaphon' = Ṣibeʿon), we learn that poets and prophets, writing for the community at large, expressed or implied the very same view (viz. that in N. Arabia was the Holy Land, and that Sinai was the great divine sanctuary), even in the post-exilic period. 'Yahweh came from Sinai,' says our psalmist, 'and beamed forth to his people[1] from Seʿir; he shone forth from Mount Paran, he came from . . . Kadesh.' Here Sinai, Seʿir, Paran, and Kadesh are combined as in Habakkuk, Teman and Mount Paran; while in the much older song of Deborah (Judg. v. 4) the place whence Yahweh proceeds to help his people is called 'the highland of Edom' (משדה אדום). The phrase used by another poet in Ps. lxviii. 8 is uncertain. בצעדך בישימון is insufficient to form a trimeter, and the preposition בְּ unexpectedly takes the place of מִ־. ישימון, as

[1] לָמוֹ is not adequately defended by the להם of Isa. xiii. 2 (Dillm., Driver), where the writer's object is to awaken a sense of mystery. למו should be לְעֵמוֹ (cp. on Ps. xxviii. 8); so von Gall. לָנוּ (Haupt and Ball, after 𝔊, Onk., Pesh., Vg.) is an arbitrary alteration.

we have seen, is a corruption of ישמן = ישמעאל. Probably we should read מִשְּׁדֵה ישמן, 'from the highland of Ishmael,' corresponding to the משדה אדום of Judg. v. 4. May we infer from these passages (Ps. lxviii. 8 perhaps excepted) that Mount Sinai was situated in the Edomite country? Or shall we slightly modify this view and suppose that Sinai (Ḥoreb) was in the land of which Yithro was the 'priest,' *i.e.* in Midian,[1] or (as Smend suggests[2]) not far from Midian, to the west (Ex. iii. 1, אַחַר)?

I think myself that the answer must be, No. Either there were two mountains called Se'ir, and two districts called Kadesh and Teman respectively, or else we must read 'Asshur' for 'Se'ir' and 'Ethman' (= Ishmael) for 'Teman,' while retaining 'Kadesh.' The latter course is preferable. That Kadesh was in very early times the centre of the Israelite people, appears certain. Kadesh (as the name—see below—may perhaps indicate) was an Asshurite place. As for Smend's inference from אחר in Ex. iii. 1, it is surely incorrect. 'Behind the wilderness,' as a topographical note, is hardly tolerable. As so often, אחר in Ex. iv. 1 comes from אשחר. As pointed out elsewhere, we should read מדבר אשחר 'to the wilderness of Ashḥur.'[3] It was to this district that Moses led his flock, and there that the 'mountain of the Godhead' rose. And this is no isolated notice. From 1 K. xix. 3 *f.*, after the text has been criticised, we learn[4] that in order to get to Ḥoreb Elijah had to go to Ishmael (MT. אל-נפשו), or, in other words, towards Yaman (MT. דרך יום). The presumption is that Ḥoreb was in the Yeraḥme'elite country. As for 'Edom' in the poetical passages referred to, it is extremely probable that we should, as in many other cases, rather read 'Aram,' and as for Teman, it is a popular corruption of ישמעאל, the connecting link being אתמן or אתמל (cp. אתם, Ex. xiii. 20, Num. xxxiii. 6-8, and אתמול (1 S. x. 11, xiv. 21). In Am. i. 12 Teman is clearly = Aram (so read in *vv.* 6, 9, 11, ii. 1). It was therefore from Aram and from Asshur that

[1] Wellhausen, Stade, Meyer, G. F. Moore.
[2] *Religionsgeschichte* (1899), p. 35 (n. 2).
[3] See *T. and B.* p. 527.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 429.

the author of the psalm we are considering brought Yahweh, Israel's God.

It will be noticed that 'Sinai' and 'Se'ir' (*i.e.* 'Asshur'), 'Paran' and 'Kadesh' (the prefix we will consider presently), are parallel. It is probable that the name 'Asshur' (or Ashḥur, or Ashtar) attached itself to the range of mountains which included Sinai or Ḥoreb (see on iii. 17); indeed, as we shall see presently, Sinai itself sometimes bore a name one component element of which was Asshur. As to Paran and Kadesh, we find it expressly stated in Num. xiii. 26 that the 'spies' came to Moses 'to the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh.' Elsewhere (Num. xx. 1, xxxiii. 36) Kadesh is placed in the wilderness of Ṣin, which may be supposed to have formed part of the wilderness of Paran. Elsewhere[1] I have, I think, made it probable that the name Ḳadesh represents Ashḥur-aram. The received text makes line 4 of the poem run, 'and came out of holy myriads' (מרבבת קדש). Putting aside less suitable corrections, we may read with confidence מִמְּרִבַת קָדֵשׁ (Ewald, Dillm., Steuernagel); 𝔊 at any rate recognises 'Kadesh.' מרבת or מריבת probably comes from מריבעל (1 Chr. ix. 40) = ארם-בעל, where בעל represents either ישמעאל or ירחמאל. Kadesh was, in fact, in the land of Asshur-Yeraḥme'el.

A great problem still awaits consideration. Line 5 runs מִימִינוֹ אֵשׁ דָּת לָמוֹ, which is usually rendered, 'At (or, from) his right hand was the fire of the law for them.' דת, 'law,' however, only occurs in late Hebrew and in the Aramaic parts of the O.T., and represents the Persian *dâta*, '(royal) law.' That the text is corrupt has been seen by recent critics, but they have thus far offered no satisfactory explanation. How, indeed, could it be otherwise when the origin of the erroneous reading אשדות or אשדת (iii. 17, iv. 49, Josh. x. 40, etc.) has been entirely missed. It is, beyond doubt, אשתור or אשתר. מימינו and למו are also corrupt. The former comes from מימין[2] = מֵיָמָן; the latter (like עולם in Gen. xxi. 33)[3] represents the fuller form ירחמאל—apparently a gloss on ימן. Thus we

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 242, 561.

[2] Renan, מֵיָמִין, 'du côté du sud' (*Hist.* i. 194). But ימן sometimes represents יָמָן, a regional name = Yeraḥme'el.

[3] See *T. and B.* pp. 321 *f.*

get [ירחמאל] מִיָּמָן אשתר, 'from Yaman-Ashtar,' or, adopting the gloss, 'from Yeraḥme'el-Ashtar.' This is probably a gloss on ממרבת קדש, 'from Meribath-Kadesh.' Here, as elsewhere, the greatest pains were taken to emphasise and render intelligible the close N. Arabian connexion of the people of Israel.

In the concluding part of the psalm (as I venture to call the poetical setting of the tribal benedictions) there is not much which calls for notice here. In *v*. 26, however, a happy idea of Hommel calls for mention. וְאֲשֶׁר prefixed to חֶרֶב (as if 'and who is the sword,' etc.) is certainly unnecessary, and according to Graf, Dillm., Steuernagel, and Bertholet, a prosaic gloss. But such an absolutely superfluous gloss is not at all probable. Hommel therefore proposes to point אֲשֵׁר; 'Asher,' originally the god of the tribe named after him, became identified with the great God Yahweh. I would rather hold myself that Asher, with a plural 'Asherim,' is a collateral form of Asshur.[1] But why should we not point אַשֻּׁר here? 'Asshur' or 'El Asshur' was probably the name of the god of some at least of the tribes which afterwards became united under the name 'Israel.' It is in itself plausible, and also favoured by metre, to read '[Yahweh] is the shield which is thy help, and Asshur the sword which is thy pride.'[2] This implies a divine duad[3]—Yahweh and Asshur, equivalent to Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el. Such a thing is not impossible. Some late writers would have shrunk from it as an infringement of monotheism. There were, however, different schools even in the monotheistic period, and archaisms like this were not impossible to all. If this view should seem hazardous to any one, an alternative is open. We may read הוּא אַשֻּׁר, 'that is, Asshur,' a gloss on איביך, 'thy enemies,' in the next line. In chap. xxxii. 'Asshur' occurs in a gloss (*v*. 42, end) as the name of Israel's enemies. This indeed will be another archaism, but the parallels for such an archaism are more abundant than for the other.

We now pass on to the blessings of the tribes. And first to Reuben's (*v*. 6). But is the saying really a benediction? Hardly, if Driver translates correctly—

[1] See *T. and B.* p. 24. [2] *Ibid.* p. 24. [3] *Ibid.* p. 16.

Let Reuben live, and not die;
But let his men be few.

Driver's opinion is that ואל־ימת was added to emphasise יחי. It was not enough to say 'let him live'; the same positive declaration is repeated in another form. But if the poet is so determined that people shall believe in the contiuued vitality of this tribe, the next line ought certainly to be in the same tone, and emphasise his energy or security. For a parallel, cp. Ps. cxviii. 17—

I shall not die, but live,
And tell out the works of Yahweh.

At the same time, we have no right to *render* with 𝔊, 'and let him (AL, Simson) be large in numbers' (on which see Hogg, *E. Bib.*, 'Simeon,' § 3), though Bertholet shows a slight inclination to return to it, 'assuming the text to be correct.' But surely the text cannot be correct; no plausible rendering of it has yet been given.[1] ואל־ימת equally calls for correction; if the old solutions fail us, new ones must be tried, and the experience gained in similar circumstances utilised. The original word which has become ואל־ימת should be one which gives the saying on Reuben a historical and geographical setting. The case is parallel to the sayings in Gen. xlix., of which only those on Dan, Gad, and Benjamin are without a definite historical reference. It is therefore more likely than not that any particular saying in Deut. xxxiii. should possess one, and in the case of Reuben the only way to make sense is to look for any traces of a historical reference which may still underlie the traditional text.

Can we doubt what the word underlying the impossible אל־ימת is? Surely not; it is ישמעאל. The two closing letters (אל) are often separated in MT., in cases where the main part of the word is corrupted; sometimes they appear as אל, sometimes as לא or לו. The form from which אל־ימת immediately comes is either יתמאל or אתמול (see above, p. 165).

[1] See Driver's discussion, *Deut.* p. 395; but is his own explanation more plausible?

The prefixed ו may come from ב. יחי, however, is not a probable word. That a tribal saying should begin 'Let him live,' is contrary to all parallels. Some more definite word is wanted; it should be a word out of which יחי may easily have arisen—such a word as יאחז = יחז. Thus we get, 'Let Reuben lay hold of Yeraḥme'el.' Such a saying corresponds excellently with the (most probably) true saying on Reuben in Gen. xlix. 3 *f.* It may also be supported by the corrected text of Gen. xxxv. 22,[1] for the received text of that passage is as violently improbable as that of Gen. xlix. 3 *f.* For some of the exploits of Reuben see 1 Chr. v. 9 *f.*, where פרת (Pĕrāth) means אפרת (Ephrath), and Gilead is the southern Gilead (as ii. 36).

Now as to *v.* 6 *b*. We have seen that this cannot be right. The easiest word to correct methodically is מתיו,[2] which, almost as plainly as אל ימת, must come from one of several similar corruptions of ישמעאל, such as יתמן or יתמול. It is almost as clear that מספר comes from ספרם. That ספר is a clan-name, we know; it is proved by קרית ספר (Josh. xv. 15) and ספרת. The בני ספרת are expressly reckoned among the בני עֲרַב־ישמעאל ('sons of Arab-Ishmael'[3]), if we accept an unavoidable correction of the improbable בני עבדי שלמה, Neh. vii. 57. A word still remains, וידי. As in *v.* 5 and in Gen. xxxviii. 14, it most probably comes from והוא or הוא, 'that is' (הוא often introduces a gloss). The result is that line 2 of the saying on Reuben consists of a gloss, 'that is, Ishmael of the Sapherites.' It is probable that the Sapherites (if this conjectural pronunciation is correct) were the same as the Ṣarephites[4] or Ṣarephathites. It was at Ṣarephath, probably the centre of this clan (which belonged to the southern Ṣidon[5]), that Elijah, according to the legend, 'found religious kinsmen who revered his own God Yahweh.'[6] But there was surely a time when neither among themselves nor

[1] *T. and B.* p. 421.

[2] מָתֵי would be grammatically more plausible; cp. iv. 27, Gen. xxxiv. 30.

[3] See *E. Bib.*, 'Solomon's Servants.'

[4] Neh. iii. 31 *f.*, where 'goldsmith,' 'goldsmiths,' should be 'Ṣarephite,' 'Ṣarephites.'

[5] *T. and B.* pp. 17, 314, 504.

[6] *T. and B.* p. 62 (n. 2). 'Yahweh' = 'Yahweh-Yeraḥme'el.'

with the more civilised N. Arabians were the tribes which afterwards became known as Israelites conscious of close religious kinship.

What, then, does the Reuben-saying tell us? It tells us that Reuben was destined to take a firm hold on the part of Yeraḥme'el occupied by the Sapherite clan. The second line of the saying has dropped out; its place is taken by words produced artificially by a scribe out of the misread glosses.

The blessing of Judah (*v.* 7), according to the analogy of Gen. xlix. 8 *f.*, should be of a martial character. The blessing which we have now to deal with, however, is in a strangely subdued tone. As the text stands, Judah appears to be fighting outside his own territory. If so, it must be with the object either of extending his own land, or of supporting some of his allies. But where in the narrative books can we find evidence of such wars of Judah as might here be referred to? For he is contending against dangerous odds, and is in urgent need of supernatural help against his enemies. It is a less natural theory, though very commonly adopted, that the passage expresses the longing of a N. Israelite that Judah might be reunited to the kingdom of Israel (so *e.g.* Stade, *Gesch.* i. 160; Wellh., Dillm., Driver, Steuernagel, Bertholet). But is such a longing probable, and would it have been thus briefly expressed? Kennett[1] proposes therefore to point שָׁמַע, and to read יְבִיאֶנּוּ, 'will He bring him in.' He thinks the phrase 'his own people' should mean 'the people of Judah' (in Judæa), and 'the voice of Judah' 'the prayer of the Jewish exiles in Babylon to be restored to their kindred in the Holy Land.' The consequence is that we get a 'double conception of Judah as being both in Babylon and in Judæa at the same time.' This can hardly be admitted. Kennett does not see (though he must be on the point of seeing) that the present unsatisfactory text covers over something different and yet not altogether irrecoverable. It is in the apparently most hopeless part of the saying that the key to the situation exists, though one may frankly admit that but for experience

[1] See art. in *J. of Theol. Stud.*, already referred to (p. 9, n. 5), July 1906.

elsewhere one would be as much baffled as Stade and others have been. The word 'baffled' may seem inconsistent with the fact that Stade has offered a correction of the violently improbable words יָדָיו רָב לוֹ, viz. יָדֶיךָ רִיב לוֹ, '(with) thy hands strive for him.' True, Stade does propose this correction, but the harshness of ידיך is intolerable, and experience shows that in such a case as that before us no superficial correction is of use. We must therefore try to look beneath the surface, and so doing one is struck by the analogy of ריב לו (so Sam. reads) to other groups of words containing לא or לו, in which this לא or לו represents the final אל in ירחמאל, while the preceding part of that word exists in a separate and equally corrupted form. Most probably that is exactly the case here. ריב לו or רב לו comes from רובאל or rather ירבעל (ירבעל), while ידיו probably comes from וידי,[1] and this from והוא, which so often introduces a gloss (see on וידי, *v.* 6 *b*). Thus we get the gloss, 'that is, Yeraḥme'el.' But to what word does this gloss relate? To clear the way, let us look backward. Can the second line in the blessing be quite right? It runs, 'and to his people mayest thou bring him in.' But what is Judah's people? Is it not Judah? Must not עמו be miswritten? If so, does not the gloss point the way to a probable correction of עמו? The ethnic of which Yeraḥme'el is the equivalent is surely Arām. Arām, too, is the region which the other blessing of Judah represents as the prize of Judah's valour[2] (Gen. xlix. 10). A parallel for the corrupt עמו may be found in Num. xxii. 5, where בני עמו is admittedly most improbable, but where the reading עמון (accepted by Dillm.) is only less unlikely.[3] In both cases we should most probably read בני אם, *i.e.* בְּנֵי אֲרָם. The gloss, 'that is, Yeraḥme'el,' was to prevent the early reader from supposing the northern Aram to be referred to. The sense therefore is—

[1] Transposition plays a great rôle in corruption. Here וידי became ויהי, whence וידו.

[2] See *T. and B.* p. 503.

[3] A Hebrew writer would not have brought a Yahweh-worshipper from the land of the benê Ammon, and even a redactor would not have put two plainly inconsistent accounts of the origin of Balaam side by side.

Hear, O Yahweh, the voice of Judah,
And bring him in (triumphantly) to Aram [that is, Yeraḥme'el],
. . . . . .
And be a helper against his adversaries.

It will be noticed that the intrusive gloss-matter has supplanted the original third line.

There is also much difficulty in the blessing of Levi (*vv.* 8-11). Meyer remarks, 'The saying gives us a distinct picture of the position of the priestly class in the older regal period, about 850 B.C. It is a single, compact work.' The phrase 'those that hate him' (*v.* 11), according to Meyer, means 'people who do not think much of the priests and their oracles, offer sacrifice unwillingly, and would rather act according to their own judgment than consult Yahweh.' By the phrase איש חסידך is meant 'the descendants of Yahweh's faithful one,' *i.e.* of Moses. That Moses is represented in the legend as the 'son,' *i.e.* descendant, of Levi, does not matter; it was through Moses that 'Levi' received his spiritual significance. Meyer also draws the conclusion that the prize which Moses hoped to gain, and actually did gain, in the contest with Yahweh, here,and here only, spoken of, was the Thummim and the Urim.[1]

I am afraid that Meyer relies here on a too conservative criticism. There are textual problems which he does not seem to have recognised. I do not observe that he questions either (*a*) תמיך ואוריך, or (*b*) לאיש חסידך, or (*c*) מן־יקומון. Before we proceed, let us consider each of these difficulties.

(*a*) Against this reading is the unusual order of the words (see Ex. xxviii. 30, Lev. viii. 8, Ezra ii. 63 = Neh. vii. 65), and the obscurity caused by the absence of a verb. The latter objection may be removed by prefixing תֵּן לְלֵוִי (so Ball, Bertholet). The former by emending תמיך into אֲמִתְּךָ, and אוריך into אורך. אמת, with reference to judicial utterances (Zech. vii. 9); אור, with regard to expositions of the law (cp. Ps. xix. 9, cxix. 30).

(*b*) לְאִישׁ חֲסִידֶךָ. The variations of the commentators justify the suspicion that all is not right here. 'To the

[1] Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 51-54.

man of thy pious one'! Who is the 'pious one'?—Moses, Aaron, the tribe of Levi, or (so Stade, very strangely) Yahweh? Ball (*PSBA*, 1896, p. 123) proposes אִישׁ חֲסִדְךָ. But 'the man who has received thy kindnesses' is not the sense required by the context. The only remedy I can see is to point לְאִישׁ, which is in apposition to חסידך. Driver, at any rate, renders as if he pointed thus. The pious one will, of course, be the tribe of Levi personified. A tradition is implied that Yahweh 'tested' Levi at Massah, and 'strove' with him at the waters of Meribah.

(*c*) מן־יקומון is supposed to mean 'that they rise not.' I cannot, however, find any parallel for it quoted by the grammarians, and יק׳ is not probable after קמיו. How shall we correct the words? Ball proposes מֵן־. Too superficial! Why should such a common word here, and here only, have become corrupted? מן (as in אחימן) is probably the latter part of ירחמאל or ישמעאל, and יקומון (like יקמעם, 1 K. iv. 12, and יקום, xi. 6, Gen. vii. 4, 23) is one of the many derivatives of ירחמאל. Either 'Yeraḥme'el' dittographed, or 'Ishmael, Yeraḥme'el' (alternatives), may be regarded as a gloss, or glosses, on משנאיו. The verb which originally stood in *b* has fallen out.

The blessing of Benjamin seems to have been much redacted. The original saying must have represented Benjamin as a warlike tribe, fighting bravely against his hostile neighbours. It may perhaps have said that his territory was בין כפתרים, 'amidst the Kaphtorim' (see *T. and B.* pp. 191 *f.*). בין כתפיו is not natural (see Dillm.).

The blessing of Joseph (*i.e.* Ephraim and Menasseh combined, *v.* 17 *b*) in *vv.* 13-17 is concerned first with the fertility of his land and then with his irresistible strength. First, Joseph's land is 'blessed of Yahweh with the most precious things of heaven above (מֵעַל, Dillm.), and with (those of) the ocean which coucheth beneath.' Then if we follow the lexicons, the poet continues thus—

> And with the precious things of the produce of the sun,
> And with the precious things of the thrusting forth of the months.

Driver finds here an allusion to 'the various crops of fruits,

vegetables, grain, etc., which ripen at different seasons of the year.' But how oddly expressed an 'allusion'! 'Produce (products) of the sun'! As if the sun were a land. 'Thrusting forth of the months'! A purely imaginary rendering, for גֶּרֶשׁ occurs nowhere else, and the root-meaning 'to thrust forth' is wildly absurd here. And how can 'months' be parallel to 'sun'? Clearly the text has suffered, and the physician must apply remedies. שמש again and again elsewhere stands for ישמעאל (see *e.g.* xi. 30),[1] and so surely it is here. Observe that in Gen. xlix. 25 we meet with the phrase ברכת רחם, where רחם is not 'womb' but a shortened form of ירחם. As for גרש, we may correct it as we have already corrected שגר in vii. 13; the original is אשחר (cp. גשור). Lastly, ירחים is, of course, ירחם, the well-known shorter form of ירחמאל. See again on Gen. xlix. 25 (*T. and B.* p. 511).

The poet continues, as most agree to render—

> And from the top of the ancient mountains,
> And with the precious things of the everlasting hills.

A few, however, explain ראש as 'best products' (instead of 'top'), and Bertholet would even emend into מראשית. This excellent scholar, at any rate, shows good judgment in questioning ראש, which, though it may mean 'best,' cannot mean 'best products.' But why should ראשית have been used instead of מגד? Hence it is, no doubt, that Driver adheres to ראש, and renders 'top.' But if the poet is under the influence of Gen. xlix. 26 (which Driver would be the last to deny), how comes he to put in a reference to the *tops* of the mountains? What sense is there in the insertion? Surely the blessing reads better without it. To this Driver may mean to reply by his brief reference to Ps. lxxii. 16, which suggests to him the explanation, 'May the mountain-sides to their very tops be fertile!' But it hardly needs a very keen sight to discover that Ps. lxxii. 16*a* is deeply corrupt. The truth seems to be that, as so often, a gloss has intruded into the original text, and expelled a part of it. The gloss is not indeed ראש, but a

[1] For other instances see *T. and B.* p. 273.

word underlying ראש. What that word is, we shall see presently. The word which it expelled can only be restored by conjecture. But can we doubt what that word is? Parallelism imperatively demands מגד.

Our next step must be to criticise the phrases הררי־קדם and גבעות עולם. In Gen. xlix. 26 we find the same phrases, except that הררי־קדם becomes (according to most critics, following ⑥) הררי עד. But how comes עד, 'eternity,' to have been altered into קדם, 'antiquity?' The two words are not parallel. The explanation is that here, as often (*e.g.* Gen. xxv. 6, xxix. 1), קדם has come from רקם = ירחם (Yarḥam),[1] and עולם from ירחמאל (Gen. xxi. 33, etc.). As has been pointed out elsewhere,[2] the original text probably had ה׳ ערב = הררי ער׳, 'mountains of Arabia,' and in the parallel line גבעות ירחמאל. That עֲרָב and רקם (ירחם) are synonyms, need not here be shown. אַשֶּׁר, miswritten as ראש, is probably a gloss on these two words (see above).

V. 16 *a* is troublesome. There is nothing corresponding to it in Gen. xlix. 26. It will be observed that the distich is devoid of parallelism. The first line gives a general reference to 'Nature at large' (Driver, who, however, regards this as a climax); the second, a loosely connected mention of the favour of the covenant-God who revealed Himself to Moses (so at least Dillmann and Driver). Let us take the first line. The vagueness is intolerable. But why must ארץ mean 'earth'? And why accept ומלאה, which comes in so awkwardly? Surely it is a corruption of ירחמאל. 'With the precious things of the land of Yeraḥme'el' is probably a gloss on *vv.* 14, 15. Line 2 runs, in MT., וּרְצוֹן שֹׁכְנִי סְנֶה. That Yahweh really had such a title as 'dweller in the thorn-bush (?),' is extremely doubtful. The title would, of course, be suggested by Ex. iii. 2, where Yahweh is, according to most, represented as the *numen* of a thorn-bush. It has, however, as I hope, been shown elsewhere[3] that both in Exodus and in the 'Blessing of Moses' סנה should be סִינַי. With this change in the text, line 2

[1] Cp. *T. and B.* p. 200.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 512. So, too, in Hab. iii. 6 (MT. הררי ער), and probably in Isa. xlvii. 7 (MT. גברת ער), lvii. 15 (שכן עד).

[3] *T. and B.* p. 526.

of *v.* 16 may stand. Line 1 has evidently fallen out, or been supplanted by the gloss pointed out just now. Line 3 also needs correction; the impossible form תְּבוּאֹתָה has probably come, not from תְּבוּאָה (König, Ges.-Kautzsch), but from תְּבוּאוֹת, which must, it would seem, have made its way into the text from the margin. The true reading was probably תהיין (Gen. xlix. 26).

Thus we shall get—inserting a possible but purely conjectural first line—

> [Let the blessings of the God of Asshur,]
> And the favour of the dweller in Sinai,
> Be upon the head of Joseph,
> On the crown of the head of the prince among his brethren.

We now come to the eulogy of Joseph's might. The text-reading of *v.* 17, ll. 1 and 2, gives—

> His firstborn steer hath majesty,
> Its horns are horns of a wild ox.

So, at least, most critics render בכור שורו, though Ed. Meyer[1] ingeniously conjectures that שורו is 'Joseph's steer-god, who begot Joseph as his firstborn, whence Joseph himself has the strength and the horns of a wild ox.' Certainly 'his firstborn steer' is a very odd expression for Jeroboam II.[2] (so Graf and Reuss), and what right have we to take שׁוֹר as a collective? But is it not equally unnatural to take שור for the steer-god?[3] It is true, however, that the subject of lines 1 and 2 in *v.* 17 must be Joseph. But to this it must be added that the text of line 1 is thoroughly wrong, or, more precisely, the original first line of *v.* 17 has been supplanted by a gloss. This interpolation is probably ברכות אשׁור וירחמאל, which corresponds exactly to the gloss in Gen. xlix. 25[4] (MT. ברכות שדים ורחם).

Zebulun and Issachar (Iskar) are coupled together (*vv.* 18 *f.*) as in Gen. xlix. 13-15, but the descriptions of

[1] *Die Israeliten*, p. 284.
[2] Ephraim is excluded by the last distich of the verse.
[3] Hos. xii. 12 and Ps. cvi. 20 would not justify this.
[4] See *T. and B.* p. 511.

the tribes in the two collections of sayings are different. The text is not free from uncertainty. 'Rejoice, Zebulun, in thy going out,' is strange; we surely require either a synonym for, or a word antithetic to, the 'tents' of Issachar, assuming, that is, that 'tents' is correct. Ball therefore proposes, for בְּצֵאתֶךָ, בְּצִאתֶיךָ (an assumed alternative to בְּצִיֶּיךָ, 'in thy ships'). But is אהליך correct? It has been pointed out elsewhere that אהל and היכל are liable to be confounded.[1] I propose, therefore, to read here היכליך, 'thy palaces.' The 'palaces' are those which, rightly or wrongly, an ancient Hebrew poet supposed Issachar to have conquered in N. Arabia. The parallel to היכליך in line 1 is, probably, צבאתיך, 'thy troops.' The warlike character of Zebulun appears from Judg. v. 18 (cp. Gen. xlix. 13, as restored in *T. and B.*).

From the present text it would seem that these two tribes sacrificed in common at some mountain sanctuary, and hospitably invited neighbouring peoples to take part in the accompanying feasts. Such occasions might naturally be used for purposes of trade. It is strange, however, that the invitation of the 'peoples' should be put first; strange, too, that the sanctuary should be so vaguely referred to as a mountain. There is surely some textual corruption. The going of the allied tribes to the sanctuary ought, of course, to be mentioned first of all. In short, we shall do well to restore יִלְכוּ, which probably fell out owing to the preceding letters ליך. It must now be added that forms of קרא not seldom (*e.g.* 2 K. xviii. 4 *b*) take the place of ירחמאל, and probably enough this is the case here.[2] עמים is altogether out of place; probably it is a variant to ימים in the next line but one, which crept in from the margin. Thus we get as lines 1 and 2—

They go to Mount Yeraḥme'el,
There they offer right sacrifices.

By Mount Yeraḥme'el may be meant one of the most

[1] Cheyne, *Psalms* (1904), i. 49, where, in the note on Ps. xv. 1, Ps. xix. 5, xxvii. 5 *f.*, lxi. 5, lxix. 26, lxxviii. 60, lxxxiv. 7 are referred to as instances. Hab. iii. 7 might probably be added.

[2] Note that 𝔊's ἐξολοθρεύσουσιν presupposes יחרימו, which, like יקראו, may come from ירחמאל. The common text of 𝔊 is in some disorder.

sacred of N. Arabian mountains, that on which Abraham would have offered up Isaac, and where too, perhaps, was the central sanctuary spoken of in the original Deuteronomic legislation (see on Dt. xii. 5). The 'right sacrifices' are those approved in Deuteronomy. Hogg's suggestion (*E. Bib.*, 'Zebulun,' § 6) that the sacred mountain must have been not far from Esdraelon, and may have been called Baal-zebul (see 2 K. i. 2, 9) is at least a subtle attempt to supply the deficiencies of MT.

Lines 3 and 4 of *v.* 19 (as usually read), according to Driver, give 'the reason why the two tribes invite foreign nations to such feasts: the wealth derived by them from the sea enables them to do so.' In line 4, in particular, he sees (with most scholars) an allusion to the manufacture of glass from the sand about 'Akko.[1] The allusion, however, is not obvious, and the text of line 4 (even more clearly than that of line 3) is highly questionable. To admit the two construct participles (שֹׁפְנֵי טְמוּנֵי) side by side, cannot be right, especially as a verb is wanting.[2] חוֹל, too, is often corrupt elsewhere, and is probably so here.[3] The problem is a hard one, but I for my part incline to think that line 4 is a collection of glosses, viz. ישמעאל = יתמול = טמוני, הוא ישמעאל = ושפני (again), חול = רחל = ירחמאל,[4] and that line 3 should run, כִּי שֶׁמַע יָמָנִים יִקְנוּ, 'for Shema of the Yamanites they acquire.' This may perhaps give the reason why Zebulun and Issachar go together to the sacred mountain. The sacrifices are sacrifices of thanksgiving. If so, the parallel line has fallen out, or been supplanted by the glosses already referred to.

Verses 20 and 21 contain the blessing of Gad. His lion-like courage (cp. 1 Chr. xii. 8) and the choiceness of his allotment are dwelt upon. The three stichi in *v.* 20 are of unequal length. It would seem that some pious scribe prefixed אשרי המרחיב. שָׁכֵן is also questionable. 'He layeth himself to rest like a lion, and teareth the arm, yea, the crown of the head,' is, at any rate, not quite natural. Or

[1] Cp. Hogg, *E. Bib.*, 'Zebulun,' § 5.

[2] For attempts at emendation see Hogg, *E. Bib.*, *l.c.*

[3] 𝔊 gives ἐμπόρια, *i.e.* רְכֻלַּת.

[4] See *T. and B.* p. 373, and note that רכלים in Neh. iii. 31 comes from ירחמאלים (*E. Bib.*, 'Merchant').

shall we render (cp. 𝔊), 'he layeth himself to rest, having torn,' etc.? Later in the passage, however, we find the troublesome words כי שם. May not this be a corruption of כּוּשָׁם, which originally stood in the margin as a correction of שכן? 'Gad is like a lion of Kusham (Kushan).' We might then continue, 'He teareth the arm,' etc.

We now pass on to *v.* 21. It is usually supposed that this passage alludes to the narrative in Num. xxxii., according to which Gad was conditionally favoured with an allotment in the rich pasture-land east of the Jordan (so the received text). The first two lines are thus rendered by Driver—

> And he looked out a first part for himself,
> For there a commander's portion was reserved.

But can ראשית stand by itself? A 'first part' of what? Bickell inserts ארץ, but this is arbitrary. And how can חלקת מחקק ספון pass for good Hebrew? סָפוּן, 'reserved,' is specially difficult. Indeed, any participle after מחקק is improbable. The next line has been rendered, 'And he came to the heads of the people.' But how can אתה, 'to come,' be construed with an accusative of the person? It has therefore been suggested[1] to read (for ספון ויתא) ויתאספון (cp. *v.* 5).[2] Certainly an inversion of the two parts of a word (when corrupted) is probable enough. But a 'paragogic Nun' only occurs once (*v.* 11) in the MT. of these blessings, and then at the end of a clause (the usual position). The value of the parallel is still further reduced by the strong probability that the word יקומון is corrupt. Besides this, who can assert that 'and the heads of the people were gathered together' fits into the context? If these are the right words, they must have come in from the margin. But they are, as I think, not the right words. It has not been observed that ספון may be a corruption of צפון,[3] which, as I have shown, often represents צבעון (= שמען = ישמעאל), and, if so, is a gloss; also that ויתא, if corrupt, may

[1] Hayman, *Cambridge University Reporter*, May 21, 1895; Giesebrecht, *ZATW*, 1887, p. 292.

[2] Cp. 𝔊, *συνηγμένων ἅμα ἀρχηγοῖς λαῶν.*

[3] Some MSS. read צפון.

most easily be corrected into ויתאו; further, that ראשי in line 3 may very well be the short for ראשית (רשי׳), and that עם, like עמו in *v.* 7, may represent אֶרֶם, while לו in line 1 may come from אל, a fragment of ירחמאל. If we further suppose that there has been some slight transposition of words owing to the misunderstanding of the scribe, we arrive at this result[1]—

וירא ראשית אֶרֶם — He saw the choicest part of Aram,
ויתאו חלקת מחקק — And coveted a leader's portion.

The concluding distich appears to mean that Gad's conduct in the matter of his allotment (Num. xxxii.) was just and right, both towards Yahweh and towards Israel.

Dan's blessing (*v.* 22) is a short one. Yet, from the prevalent point of view, it presents one difficulty. 'Dan is a lion's whelp | That leapeth forth from Bashan'; but if the northern Dan is referred to, how can he be likened to a lion of Bashan? As Ed. Meyer[2] remarks, the name 'Bashan' here receives a surprisingly wide reference. That lions of Bashan are not elsewhere referred to is of less importance. What, then, shall we say to the former difficulty? The answer is that though Dan did not live in the best known land of Bashan, he did dwell for a time in the original Bashan, *i.e.* Abshan or 'Arab-Ishmael.[3]

In the blessing of Naphtali (*v.* 23) there is, first of all, the question whether Naphtali is addressed, and directed to occupy his territory, or whether the poet declares that this favoured tribe actually possesses the land assigned to it. The MT. gives וְרָשָׁה, which is explained as a strengthened imperative Ḳal in pause. Sam., however, gives וירש, and 𝔊, Onk., Pesh., Vg. all presuppose the 3rd person. A recent critic[4] leaves line 2 of the blessing untranslated, declaring that ים ודרום ירשה is entirely obscure. Dillmann, it is true, does not think so. 'Naphtali's land,' he says, 'though chiefly a highland region in the north, is neverthe-

[1] נִי שָׁם has been already accounted for as a marginal correction.

[2] *Die Israeliten*, p. 526 (n. 1).

[3] See on iii. 1 (Og, king of Bashan), and cp. *Crit. Bib.* on Josh. xix. 40 *ff.*, and *T. and B.* p. 571.

[4] Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 541.

less to be extended southward by the Lake of Ḥûleh and the Jordan to the Lake of Gennesaret.' This does not seem at all obvious. ים ודרום most naturally means not 'sea and south-land' (Dillm.), 'the lake and the south' (Driver), but 'west and south.' In this perplexity, let us assume the text to be corrupt, and apply ordinary methods of correction. We know that ים often stands for יָמָן, and that letters are often inserted, omitted, or transposed, so that דרום may easily have come from נמרוד or נמרד. In Mic. v. 5 the MT. gives ארץ נמרוד as a parallel to ארץ אַשּׁוּר, and it can be shown that the Asshur who is referred to in this passage is not Assyria, but the N. Arabian Asshur.[1] נמרוד, therefore, being parallel to אשור, must be also a N. Arabian regional name, and so, presumably, is the נמרוד which underlies the דרום in the blessing of Naphtali. נמרוד may, or may not, have stood in the original text of the blessing. In case it did not stand there, it is well to mention that נמרד in Gen. x. 8 has probably come from נמרך (רחמן), and that the statement 'Kush begot Raḥman' appears to be followed by the gloss, 'That is, Yeraḥme'el.'[3] So, then, 'sea and south' should be 'Yaman and Raḥman.' Perhaps the poet does but seek to show his learning. Or perhaps there really were two separate districts known by equivalent names. At any rate the local reference of Naphtali's blessing, like that in Gen. xlix. 21 (revised text), is N. Arabian.

The blessing of Asher (*vv.* 24 *f.*) is perhaps not quite as questionable as that in Gen. xlix. 20, not at least till we come to the last line. The hyperbole in *v.* 24 (end) may be paralleled by Job xxix. 6, and the bolts of iron and bronze remind us of the bronze bars of city-gates in 1 K. iv. 13. At the same time the hyperbole referred to would be quite isolated both in this special blessing and in the whole collection of sayings, and the parallel passage in Gen. xlix. 11 (see *T. and B.* pp. 505 *f.*) is corrupt. One may also doubt whether the blessing of Asher in the traditional text of both the collections is quite grand enough,

[1] See *T. and B.* p. 182. In *v.* 4 note the gloss זה שלום, *i.e.* זה ישמעאל, 'this is (means) Ishmael,' referring to the word אשור which follows.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 183.

especially for the closing blessing, as here. The first two lines indeed may pass, but ושבל בשמן רגלו should probably be רבשל ברזל ונחשת דבאך, and תובל בישמן גבלו should be וחשתן בַּעֲרָב. To explain this I may refer to *T. and B.* p. 109, where it is pointed out that in Gen. iv. 22 חשתן ורבשל, underlying נחשת וברזל, is a pair of glosses on Tubal-ḳain, and that חשתן stands for Ashḥur-Ethan, and רבשל for ʿArab-Ishmael. Thus we get the distich—

Tubal in Ishmael is his district,
Rabshal and Ḥashtan in Arabia.

בערב, 'in Arabia,' doubtless needs explaining. This, however, is not at all difficult. מנעלך and וכימיך in MT. also have to be accounted for. Let us take מנעלך first. This is usually explained 'thy bolts.' But should we not rather expect 'thy bars'? And what authority have we for 'thy bolts'? The versions do not favour this; 𝔊, Pesh., Vg. give 'thy shoes,' and such is very possibly the interpretation implied by the points. What, then, is the underlying word? To answer this, let us take מנעלך together with וכימיך. That the latter word is corrupt, need not be argued at length, and we may (judging from our experience) naturally suppose that the name of a place or region underlies it. It is probable that מנעלך and כימיך have the same original, and that that original is יקנעם. This is one of the numerous derivatives, or popular corruptions, of ירחמאל; it may be grouped with יקמעם, ענן, ענק, יעקן.[1] That there was a northern Yoḳneam does not militate against the prior existence of a Yoḳneam in the N. Arabian border-land. And now as to the בערב underlying דבאך. That something must be done with דבאך is plain; simply to remark with Ed. Meyer,[2] that the stichus containing the word is 'altogether obscure,' is to confess that the old critical methods are here powerless. It is also, apparently, to assume that the rest of the blessing is free from questionable matter. Surely it is no unreasonable conjecture that דבא, like רבע in Num. xxxi. 8, Josh. xiii. 21, and באר in i. 5 (see above), has come from עֲרַב, or more precisely that דבאך represents בערב, the final ך (כ) having come from ב.

[1] Cp. *Crit. Bib.* pp. 406, 427 *f.* [2] *Ibid.* pp. 541 *f.*

We are now face to face with the close of the whole book, and of the great hero's life. We are told how Moses went up the appointed mountain, and surveyed the land which had been already promised to the patriarchs, and which he would himself so gladly have trodden. Then, in that same country, he died, and in the valley over against Beth-peor (cp. iii. 29) he was buried, but tradition did not point out the sepulchre. May we not, then, suppose that, according to an earlier legend, he escaped death, and was at once taken up, like the parallel hero Elijah, into heaven? This would at any rate be a fitting close to the career of the great 'man of God,' and is 'at least analogous to the early Christian belief in a spiritual assumption.'[1] From this point of view the site of the mountain becomes less important. We may place it in the land of Moab (xxxiv. 5), or, if we will, in the neighbourhood of Kadesh,[2] which seems once to have been regarded as the centre of the primitive Israelites. The mountain was called Nebo, alluding, as Jastrow[3] thinks, to the fact that Moses was a *nābī*; perhaps, however, נבו is a broken form of סנבו, as to which see on xxxii. 48-52. Whether the name Nebā, which is attached to the top of a headland five miles S.W. of Heshbon, has anything to do with Mount Nebo, is doubtful, and the same may be very positively said of a proposed identification with the neighbouring headland Rās Ṣiaghah, the slopes of which fall steeply on all sides to the Jordan Valley and the Dead Sea.[4] In fact, the limited view from the top of this mountain seems to recent scholars to put the identification out of the question.[5]

It appears, however, to have been made probable that the original Land of Promise was in the N. Arabian borderland (see on xi. 24, Ex. xxiii. 31). The names of districts and boundaries in *vv.* 2 and 3 were originally applied to parts of that region, and some of them at least were after-

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 19; cp. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 15, quoted by Charles, *Assumption of Moses*, p. 107.

[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Moses,' § 16.

[3] *Religion of Bab. and Ass.* p. 130 (n. 1).

[4] Conder, *Heth and Moab*, pp. 132 *f.*

[5] See especially G. B. Gray, 'Mount Nebo,' *Expositor*, November 1904, and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Nebo,' ii.

wards carried northward. In *v.* 2 הים האחרון may have come from ימן אשחרן, *i.e.* Ashḥurite Yaman (see on xi. 24). כִּכָּר may be a corruption of אשכר (see *T. and B.* p. 380). ירחו may, here and elsewhere, represent ירחון, the name of a border-stream or wady (see *T. and B.* p. 228). For עיר תמרים we should perhaps read עֲרַב רמתים (*ibid.* p. 448). On Ṣoar see *T. and B.* p. 303. How far these writers really knew the geography of the border-land, I would not determine. But here, at any rate, was their true Holy Land, the region as near Paradise (with its four streams) as imagination could suggest—the land of their patriarchs, of their prophet-legislator, and of their favourite king, idealised by the mysterious power of a popular legend, David.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND NAMES

INDEX OF BIBLICAL AND COGNATE LITERARY PASSAGES

THE END

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, *Edinburgh.*